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Preface

Transcription practices

This dissertation falls somewhere between the fields of historical linguistics and textual (manuscript) scholarship, which over the years have developed different, sometimes opposing, stylistic standards. For the ease of the reader, I have tried to adhere to a strict style regarding the presentation of quotations, tokens, citations of forms, and other material, which can be described as follows.

In-line quotations taken directly from a manuscript are given in double quotation marks " " followed by the siglum of the manuscript and the folio and line number(s) from which the quotation is taken. If no siglum is given, the manuscript may be assumed to be Codex B, the focus of the present dissertation. A translation is then given in square brackets [ ].

Single tokens are given in angled brackets ⟨ ⟩ followed by the siglum, folio, and line number(s). For the sake of brevity, multiple tokens may be given in a single form in angled brackets, followed by the folios and line numbers when only two tokens, or the total number of tokens when three or more. When multiple tokens are given in a single citation, some orthographic differences may be leveled, such as the difference between ⟨i⟩ and ⟨j⟩ or between ⟨u⟩ and ⟨v⟩, the use of a nasal stroke versus a written ⟨m⟩ or ⟨n⟩, and the use of capital versus lowercase letterforms.

Longer quotations and discussions of variants are given in block quotations with a critical apparatus. The quotation is preceded by the siglum of the manuscript (occasionally by an abbreviation of the title of the work) and is followed by the folio(s) and line number(s). When relevant, an interlinear gloss is given and/or a translation of the passage in single quotations ‘ ’. A horizontal line separates the passage from the critical apparatus; the variant reading from the passage indicated with corner brackets ⸣ ⸣ is written again beneath the line, followed by a right square bracket ]. If no reading is given in corner brackets, the entire passage is the variant. Following the bracket are the variant readings from other manuscripts, followed by siglum, folio(s), and line number(s) and separated with a semicolon.

Symbols used in quotations and tokens follow the practice of the Arnamagnæan Collection as described by Stefán Karlsson (1963, lxvii-lxviii). New lines are indi-
cated with a single pipe | and new pages with a double pipe ||; line and folio numbers are not given as superscripts following the pipes, however, as they are given after the quotation. Abbreviations are expanded in italics, though non-specific abbreviation markers (points, etc.) are given in parentheses ( ), e.g. “mān” for “mān” but “S(ilfr)” for “S.” Above-line additions are indicated with inward-facing addition markers ⸌ ⸍ and marginal additions with outward-facing ‘ ’, while deletions are indicated with deletion markers | }. Illegible text is indicated with the digit 0, with the number of digits corresponding to the assumed number of illegible characters. Supplied text is given in square brackets [ ].

These practices are likewise followed, with some differences, in the critical edition at the end of this dissertation (Appendix D).

Normalized word-forms are given in italics, with definitions glossed in single quotations ‘ ’. Where relevant, grammatical information will be given in small capitals; abbreviations can be found in the abbreviation list. Normalization of Nordic forms follows the standards discussed in §1.2.

Sigla and citing of tokens

Tokens cited directly from manuscripts of Guta lag are given in angled brackets ⟨ ⟩ followed by the siglum of the manuscript: A (B 64 ‘Codex A’), B (AM 54 4to ‘Codex B’), G (B 65), or D (AM 55 4to). When no siglum is given, the token derives from Codex B.

Tokens cited from runic inscriptions are given in bold followed by the inscription’s number according to the series Sveriges runinskrifter and the edition Danmarks runeindskrifter (Jacobsen and Moltke 1942). Tokens cited from the runic calendars (§1.3.3) are also given in bold, followed by the siglum CR (Computus Runicus) for the 1328 calendar and AGW (Analecta Gotlandensia Walliniana) for the calendar from 1527. Page and line numbers are given in the format 0:0, date and month are in the format 0/0, following the practices in Lithberg and Wessén (1939), where these forms can be found.

Tokens cited from the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild (§1.3.4) are given in italics followed by the siglum StSC and line number according to the transcription in Pernler (1986, 70-71).

Translations and glosses

Unless followed by a citation of a secondary source, all translations and glosses of source materials are my own. I have consulted Christine Peel’s English translations of Guta lag and Guta saga (Peel 2015) as well as the glossary in her dissertation (Peel 2006) as an aid, though have attempted to provide a translation that best shows my own understanding of the source material; commonality with Peel’s works are nonetheless inevitable.
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Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 54 4to has, since its first mention in a scholarly publication (Schlyter 1852), suffered the unfortunate fate of bearing the designation ‘B’. As one of the two main codices written in Old Gutnish containing Guta lag, the medieval law code of the island of Gotland in the Baltic sea, Codex B is a crucial source for our understanding of both the easternmost Old Nordic language and the easternmost medieval Nordic law. Yet marked by its relatively young age, linguistic peculiarities, and foreign scribe, this sixteenth-century manuscript is quickly deemed a corrupt version of the text and language, and thus inferior to the elder manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, B 64, better known as ‘Codex A’.

Codex B was written in 1587 by David Hansen Bilefeld, a Danish priest on Gotland at a time when the island formed part of the Kingdom of Denmark. Bile-
feld writes in the colophon that he copied the text from a manuscript written in 1470; this manuscript, now lost, may too have been copied by a Danish priest or magistrate. Nevertheless, the text of *Guta lag* in Codex B is not written in Bilefeld’s native Danish, but rather in the related, though foreign and antiquated language, Old Gutnish.

Previous scholarship of *Guta lag* and the Old Gutnish manuscript corpus is in general agreement that Codex B shows a markedly younger form of the language yet preserves an older recension of the text than Codex A (thus e.g. Schlyter [1852, xi-xii; Pipping [1905-07, xviii; Holmbäck and Wessén [1979b, lxv). Taking its point of departure in this sentiment, the present study investigates the text, context, and language of Codex B, focusing on two central questions:

1. How does Codex B differ from Codex A linguistically, and from the rest of the *Guta lag* corpus textually?
2. What are the sources of these differences?

In other words, are these differences due to the retention of older textual or linguistic forms, or are they later developments in Codex B or its recension? Are they the result of the Danish scribe of Codex B, or were they already present in the now-lost exemplar manuscript from 1470? Finally, is it possible to determine, as Pipping ([1901, 73) previously mused, whether the exemplar manuscript was also copied by a Dane?

Before turning to Codex B and the other *Guta lag* manuscripts in Chapters 2-6, the present chapter provides the background for the present study. The first section (§1.1) examines the medieval history of Gotland with focus on the island’s connection to Denmark to understand why a Danish priest would have been interested in copying a manuscript containing the Gotlandic law. The language of medieval Gotland and its position within the broader scope of Nordic languages is discussed thereafter (§1.2), followed by a discussion of *Guta lag* and other sources of Old Gutnish (§1.3). Following these is a presentation of previous research into Codex B, beginning with editions of the manuscript and followed by linguistic studies (§1.4). Finally, the theoretical frameworks, methods, and outline of the present study are presented in the closing section (§1.5).

1.1 A Danish history of Gotland

When Valdemar Atterdag invaded Gotland in 1361, he ushered in decades of warring over control of the island, followed by two and a half centuries of Danish rule. Yet by the time of this forcible takeover, Denmark had already been exerting some influence on Gotland for nearly two centuries.
In the twelfth century, when manuscript accounts connect Gotland to Sweden, the Gotlanders began minting a domestic coinage, predating the earliest medieval Swedish coinage by forty years. Myrberg (2010) argues this coinage to be an assertion of Gotland’s independent role as a trading power in the Baltic in the face of surrounding rising foreign powers, including the island’s southern neighbors Denmark and Germany. The earliest coinage, dating from the 1140s, shows clear influence from northwestern Germany and Frisia, both in their iconography (a clover cross on the obverse with a church on the reverse) and production method (a particularly angular hammering known as Vierschlag), claims Myrberg (2010, 163). A second coinage, produced in Visby by 1170, imitates Danish coins during the reign of King Niels (r. 1104-1134) inscribed with the words PAX PORTA ‘peace of the gate’, though with the addition NI, NY, or NV, for NOVA ‘new’, clearly in reference to the rise of Visby as the main trading port on the island. This new coinage, argues Myrberg (2010), shows a clear shift of focus towards Denmark:

The PAX PORTA-coins indicate that the Gotlanders oriented themselves towards the Danish sphere at this time. The important Danish ally was in this case not primarily the king but the Church and its primas, head of all Scandinavian bishops and dioceses. The Danish nobility were also intimately tied to the new royal families in Swedish Östergötland, antagonists of the Svear. Thus the Gotlanders build their new alliances to stand free from the Svear but not to become dependent on the German connections. (Myrberg 2010, 170)

The connection to the Church in particular is significant. Around 1130 Gotland became a part of the Diocese of Linköping in Östergötland (Myrberg 2010, 166),

---

1 The earliest account comes from Wulfstan of Hedeby’s voyage (ninth century) in Alfred the Great’s translation of Orosius, found in the eleventh-century manuscript London, British Library, Cotton Tiberius B.i., wherein the traveler claims Gotland belongs to Sweden (“and þās land hȳrað tō Swēom”; Sweet 1908, 21). Peel (2015, 255) warns that Wulfstan’s account “must be treated with caution”, as it claims Blekinge, which was Danish by the eleventh century, to be Swedish in the ninth. A twelfth-century account of bishoprics and church divisions in the North, known as the Florence List (Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Codex Ashburnham 1554) lists a number of Swedish ‘islands’, including Guthlandi. Again caution must be employed, due to a number of other errors in the document (cf. Nyberg 1991, 169, 170). The oldest written record of the name Gotland can be found in an eleventh-century runic inscription in Uppland, which mentions Swedes taking tribute in Gotland (þa þir · kialt · toku · a kutlanti U 614).

Evidence in the opposite direction, namely Danish control over Gotland in the eleventh century, might be found in Adam of Bremen’s account of the North. Gotland is curiously not mentioned in the Gesta Hammaburgensis ecclesiae pontificum, though the island of Hulm or Holm, presumably Bornholm, is mentioned twice. The second mention describes a celebrated Danish port on an island near Scania and Götaeland (“illam, quae Sconiae ac Gothiae proxima Holmus appellatur, celeberrimus Daniae portus et fida stacio navium”), which may instead be in reference to Gotland (cf. Schmeidler 1917, 243).
which it would remain under until the founding of a separate Diocese of Visby in 1572. As with the other Scandinavian dioceses, Linköping came under the Archdiocese of Lund at the latter’s founding in 1104 and remained at least nominally subordinate after the founding of a Swedish archdiocese at Uppsala in 1164 (Sawyer and Sawyer 1993, 115; see also Pernler 1977, 60-65).

It was under these circumstances that Guta lag, the law code of the Gotlandic people, came to be codified. The turn of the thirteenth century saw the codification of the Danish provincial laws, starting with Skånske lov – covering the regions of Scania, Halland, Blekinge, and Bornholm – sometime between 1202 and 1216 and likely under the direction of the Danish archbishop of Lund, Anders Sunesen (c. 1167-1228). The latter was likely also behind the codification of Guta lag around 1220, considering his interest in both provincial law (having commissioned the Latin translation of Skånske lov) and in the island of Gotland, which he visited in 1207 (Peel 2013, xix; Koch and Olrik 1942).

The earliest documentation for Swedish political control over Gotland stems from the reign of Magnus III Ladulås (r. 1275-1290) who in 1285 issued a decree (SDHK 2015, no. 1318; Yrwing 1940, 63-66) compelling the islanders to pay an annual levy known as Ladongslam (OSw. læþungslamí) around midsummer (“singularis annis circa festum beati Johannis Baptistæ”). The decree alludes to an earlier state of affairs, wherein the Gotlanders were neither required to join Swedish military expeditions nor pay the levy unless demanded by the king in writing (“nisi expeditio ipsa esset eis per literas nostras”).

Only a decade prior, however, the same king granted Gotlandic merchants the right of toll-free trade in the Kingdom of Sweden (“Regni nostri”; SDHK 2015, no. 1000); that same year, 1276, Magnus Ladulås granted similar privileges to merchants in Riga, well outside his kingdom, specifically mentioning the rights already given to merchants from Gotland and Lübeck (“velut illi de Gotlandia et Lubeke similii modo servent”; SDHK 2015, no. 991). Magnus Ladulås was not the first king to grant such privileges to Gotlandic traders; nearly half a century before, King Henry III (r. 1216-1272) granted toll-free trade in England (SDHK 2015, no. 512), making no mention of Sweden or the Swedish king, indicating the Gotlanders’ autonomy in such dealings in the mid-thirteenth century.

Following the death of Magnus Ladulås in 1290, Sweden fell into a civil war between the king’s son Birger Magnusson (r. 1290-1318) and the new young king’s brothers Eric and Valdemar. The resolution of the conflict in 1310 resulted in the division of Sweden into three parts, with Birger receiving Gotland, among other regions. Significantly, the treaty specifies Gotland together with the city of Visby.

---

3On the connection between the decree from 1285 and the final chapter of Guta saga, see §1.3.2 below.
4See also Yrwing (1940, 9-45).
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(“et terram Gothlandiae cum Visby”; SDHK 2015, 2376). Following this division of the kingdom, in 1313, Birger raised the taxes installed by his father, which would eventually be abolished by his successor, Magnus IV Eriksson (r. 1319-1364), in 1320 (cf. SDHK 2015, no. 3018).

It was during the latter’s reign that the Danish king Valdemar IV Atterdag (r. 1340-1375), in his campaign to restore Denmark to its previous greatness, invaded the island of Gotland in 1361, augmenting his title to King of the Danes, Slavs, and Goths (“Danorum, Sklavorum, Gothorumque rex”; e.g. SDHK 2015, no. 8382, September 1363). A power struggle ensued from three angles, with Denmark on one side under Valdemar Atterdag and his daughter, Queen Margaret I (r. 1387-1412); Sweden on another side under Albert of Mecklenburg (r. 1364-1389); and the Teutonic Order on the third front, especially under the Grand Master (Hochmeister) Konrad von Jungingen (r. 1393-1407) and his brother, Ulrich (r. 1407-1410).

By the turn of the fifteenth century Sweden was no longer a major force on the island, and negotiations regarding control were held between Queen Margaret, whose power across Scandinavia culminated in the foundation of the Kalmar Union (1397) and executed through her nephew Eric of Pomerania (r. 1389-1439) and the Teutonic Order, whose power across the Baltic was beginning to decline. The latter ceded Gotland, after nearly a decade of negotiations, in 1408, issuing in two and a half centuries of Danish control over the island.

Soon thereafter, in 1411, Eric began construction on Visborg Castle, a fortification in the city of Visby where, after the Engelbrekt rebellion of 1434, the deposed king would spend his final years. The untimely death of his nephew and successor, Christopher of Bavaria (r. 1440-1448), in 1448 led to a true dissolution of the Kalmar Union, with Sweden electing Karl Knutsson Bonde (r. 1448-1457, 1464, 1467-1470) to the throne, and the Danes electing Christian I (r. 1448-1481).

The newly elected kings quickly struggled for the crown of the third realm, Norway, as well as for control of the other territories of the dissolving union. Karl Knutsson invaded Gotland in 1449, only to be stopped in Visby by the Danish nobleman Oluf Axelsen Thott (†1464), who would later become vassal of the island (Yrwing 1978, 56-63).

A second Swedish attempt at taking Gotland occurred in 1524 under Gustav Vasa (r. 1523-1560), who was determined to gain control over territories he considered Swedish. At the Treaty of Stettin in 1570, however, Sweden was forced to renounce any claims over these lands, though the eastern Danish territories of

---

5 See e.g. Yrwing (1978, 51-54), Arup (1932, 144-151), and Eimer (1966).
7 Issued 1 November 1408 in Marienburg (Dipl. Dan. 2010, no. 14081101001).
8 Plans for a fortification had likely already been started by members of the Teutonic Order; cf. Sørensen (2014, 305), Eimer (1966, 306).
Scania, Blekinge, and Halland would later be ceded to Sweden at the Treaty of Roskilde in 1658 (Yrving 1978, 77-79).

Gotland was ceded to Sweden in 1645 as a result of the Treaty of Brömsebro (Linton 1995, 435), thus ending centuries of Danish influence and control over the Baltic island.

1.2 Old Gutnish in its linguistic context

Old Gutnish (OGu.) and its modern descendant Modern Gutnish (Gu.) belong to a group of related languages known as the Nordic languages or North Germanic, a branch of the Germanic subfamily of the Indo-European languages. Within historical linguistics, the most important Old Nordic language has traditionally been Old Icelandic, largely due to its immense corpus of saga literature together with the preservation of many archaic features in Modern Icelandic. As a consequence, the term Old Norse is often used synonymously with Old Icelandic, though it may also be used to refer to the Old Nordic languages in general (Ottosson 2002, 787). To avoid ambiguity, I will refrain from using the term Old Norse in reference to a single language; instead, I will group the North Germanic languages preserved in manuscript material under the term Old Nordic, and refer to individual languages therein by unique names.

The following section presents an overview of the Nordic languages, both Old Nordic and modern language variants, from which I have drawn comparative material, together with a reference to the standard dictionaries whose normalization practices I follow. Thereafter I discuss some characteristic features of Old Gutnish and conclude with a description of the normalization practices I have adopted for the present work.

1.2.1 The Nordic languages

The Old Nordic languages are traditionally divided into two groups, representing two historical branches of the North Germanic family tree, namely Old East Norse and Old West Norse. This bifurcation of the Nordic languages is generally accepted among scholars, though there is little consensus as to exactly which linguistic features distinguish these two branches. Furthermore, the position of Old Gutnish

10Sometimes referred to as Gotlandic. Though the terms have traditionally been used interchangeably, one should perhaps maintain a difference between Gutnish (Sw. gutniska or gutamål), being the descendant of Old Gutnish, and Gotlandic (Sw. gotländska), the dialect of Swedish as spoken by Gotlanders (p.c. Rasmus Lund, 31 July 2017). See also §1.3.5.

11Noreen (1913, 17-18), for example, lists nine differences between East and West Norse, while Brøndum-Nielsen (1928-73, 2-4) lists twelve, though lacks two of those listed by Noreen. Wessén (1968, 32-33) adds one difference not found in either of the earlier two lists, though gives only eight
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on the family tree is at times the subject of debate; Schulte (2002, 878-879) notes that “[o]n a surface level, OGu. shows a characteristic blend of [East Norse] and [West Norse] isoglosses plus a number of single language developments”. The tendency within Old Norse scholarship, however, is to group Old Gutnish with the East Norse languages.

Old West Norse is mainly represented by Old Icelandic (OIcel.), the language of Iceland from the settlement (ca. 874) until ca. 1350, though the period can be delimited to what Noreen (1923, 8) refers to as Classical Old Icelandic, ca. 1150-1350. Closely related to Old Icelandic is Old Norwegian (ONorw.), the language of Norway from roughly the same period. Given the prevalence of Old Icelandic, I will primarily cite Old Icelandic forms as representative of Old West Norse, following the normalization practices set by the Dictionary of Old Norse Prose (ONP 2010). These two languages are further survived by Modern Icelandic (Icel.) and Norwegian (Norw.), the latter being marked by wide dialect variation and two written standards, Bokmål or Dano-Norwegian (based on written Danish) and Nynorsk. Modern Icelandic forms follow the standard given in Íslensk Orðabók (Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon 1989); Modern Norwegian will generally refer to Nynorsk as standardized in Norsk Ordbok (1966-2016). Also belonging to the West Norse languages is Faroese (Far.), the language of the Faroe Islands; forms cited are taken from Føroysk Orðabók (Poulsen et al. 1998).

Old East Norse comprises the languages of Sweden and Denmark from ca. 800 until the Reformation. More specifically, Old Swedish (OSw.) refers to the language of the earliest law codes of Sweden, ca. 1225-1350, which Noreen (1904, 3) labels Classical Old Swedish. Normalization of Old Swedish is a constant difficulty in current scholarship; in general, I will follow the same practice for Old Swedish as for Old Gutnish (see §1.2.3), with the exception that the (prevocalic) voiced fricatives [ɣ] and [β] are given as gh and v, and the svarabhakti vowel as e. Old Swedish is survived today by Modern Swedish (Sw.); forms cited are taken from Svenska Akademiens Ordbok (SAOB 1898-).

---

12 While the purpose of the present study is not to settle the debate as to whether or not Old Gutnish belongs to the East Norse branch, it will become evident throughout that the language has more innovations in common with Old East Norse than with Old West Norse; developments which also occurred in Old West Norse are furthermore not always clear in their chronology, making it difficult to pinpoint whether such changes are “common” innovations in Old Gutnish and Old West Norse (cf. Williams 2007, 236). Loss of *u̯ in anlaut before r, for example, is argued by Eklund (1991, 150, 178 et passim) to be an independent development on Gotland, while the widespread presence of i-umlaut in Old Gutnish is often the result of leveling (§4.3.7) and frequently does not align with Old West Norse.

13 Cf. the discussion in Williams (2012) and Boeck (2013, 79ff.).
Old Danish (ODa.) is used specifically to refer to the period from 1100-1515, the period covered by *Gammeldansk Ordbog* (GDOB 1999-), whose normalization practice I follow with one exception: the use of macrons to indicate long vowels. However, as the main topic of the present work is a post-Reformation manuscript copied by a Dane, references to Danish forms will more frequently be given in *Modern Danish* (Da.), the descendant of Old Danish from ca. 1500 until the present day; forms are taken from *Ordbog over det danske Sprog* (ODS 1919-).

Alongside the standard languages Swedish and Danish are a number of dialects or languages which are more difficult to place in the family tree, though provide crucial insights into the history of the Nordic languages. In Central Sweden, the Dalecarlian dialects have increasingly come under closer scrutiny by language historians, especially the Elfdalian (Elfd.) language spoken in the Älvdalen parish, due to its linguistic conservatism. Elfdalian forms cited follow the normalization practice in *Älvdalsk Ordbok* (Steensland 2010). Also belonging to the Upper Siljan (Sw. Ovansiljan) group of Dalecarlian languages (cf. Levander 1925-1928, 19ff. and Sapir 2005, 4-8) is the language variant spoken in the parish of Orsa (Sw. Orsamål); forms cited are taken from *Orsaord* (Ohlén and Olander 2013).

### 1.2.2 Features of Old Gutnish grammar

As an Old Nordic language, Old Gutnish closely resembles its sister dialects, though key differences set the language apart. As Söderberg (1879) notes:

> Den skandinaviska dialekt, med hvilken vi göra bekantskap redan i Gotlands äldsta runinskrifter med yngre runor, men hvars mest omfattande och vigtigaste språkinnesmärken vi dock träffa i de bevarade handskrifterna af Guta lag och Gutasaga, intager en så egendomelig ställning såväl til den svensk-danska som til den norsk-isländska grenen af den skandinaviska språktamen, att det torde kunna anses fullt berättigadt att behandla denna dialeks grammatik särskilt. (Söderberg 1879, 1)

[The Scandinavian dialect, with which we already become familiar in Gotland's oldest runic inscriptions with the younger futhark, though whose most comprehensive and important linguistic monuments we find in the extant manuscripts of *Gutalag* and *Gutasa*, holds as unique a position to the Swedish-Danish as to the Norwegian-Icelandic branches of the Scandinavian language tree, that it may be considered justifiable to treat this dialect's grammar separately.]

---

14 For an outline of Elfdalian language and history, see Sapir (2005). In the present work, I intentionally use the term *Elfdalian* (from Sw. *Älvdalska*) instead of the equally common *Övdalian* (from Elfd. *Övdalsk*) on purely linguistic grounds, as *Elfdalian* is permissible in English both phonetically and orthographically, while *Övdalian* is impossible.
So far no complete grammar of Old Gutnish has been published, and discussions of the language are usually presented in contrast to the other Old Nordic languages, most frequently Old Icelandic and Old Swedish. The following provides a synthesis of the main features of Old Gutnish as presented by Söderberg (1879, 47), Noreen (1904, 22-23), Wessén (1968, 107-108), Bandle (1973, 106-109), Haugen (1976, 210-213), and Schulte (2002, 89). No two scholars give an identical list of features, nor are the features always presented with the same explanation:

1. Old Gutnish preserves the Proto-Germanic diphthongs *ai and *au: stain masc ‘stone’, dauþr adj ‘dead’ (OIcel. steinn, dauðr; OSw. stēn, dø̄ þer; Gu. stain, daudar). Nordic i-umlaut of *au > *øy develops into oy (Gu. ái): hoyra wk vb ‘to hear’ (OIcel. heyra; OSw. hø̄ ra; Gu. håirä).

2. Before geminates ai and au contract to a: nom sg masc ann ‘one’, fem ain; nom sg masc dauþr ‘dead’, neut datt ‘dead’ (OIcel. einn, ein; dauðr, dautt; Gu. ann, ain; daudar, datt).

3. PGmc. *eu develops into a triphthong iau, perhaps via a medial stage *iǫu: liaus neut ‘light’ (OIcel. ljós, OSw. liūs, Gu. liaus).

4. PGmc. short *u is preserved due to the lack of a-umlaut: sup brutít ‘broken’ (OIcel., OSw. brotit; Gu. brutt).

5. Before anteconsonantal r, however, *u lowers to o: korn neut ‘kernel, grain’, þorka str vb ‘to dry’ (OIcel. korn, þurrka; OSw. korn, þörka; Gu. kàmn, tårkä). This lowering is often blocked by preceding b: burt or bort adv ‘away’ (OIcel. burt; OSw. bort; Gu. burt or bårt).

---

15 Previously published in Wessén (1959, 515).
16 Fårö only.
6. Nordic u-umlaut, which is stronger in the west (Bandle 1973, 28ff.), is entirely missing in Gutnish: \textit{hauþ neut 'head', nom pl barn neut 'children', hän pron 'she'} (OIcel. \textit{hófuð, bôrn, hón}; OSw. \textit{hovuþ, barn or bôrn, hôn}; Gu. \textit{haud, barn or ban, ha}).

Söderberg (1879), Noreen (1904), Wessén (1968), Haugen (1976)

7. Nordic i-umlaut, on the other hand, occurs in more environments in Old Gutnish than in the other Old Nordic languages, most notably in short syllables, where typically both an umlauted and non-umlauted form co-exist: \textit{staþr masc 'place; city', rugr rygr masc 'rye'} (OIcel. \textit{staðr, rugr}; OSw. \textit{staþer, rogher or rugher}; Gu. \textit{stad or städ, ryg}).

Wessén (1968), Schulte (2002)

8. The umlaut vowels *ǣ and *ø̄ are not found in Old Gutnish, having merged with the higher vowels ē (Gu. e or ei) and ŷ (Gu. ŷ): \textit{mēla wk vb 'to speak', dȳma wk vb 'to judge; to deem'} (OIcel. \textit{mǽla, dǿma}; OSw. \textit{mǣla, dø̄ ma}; Gu. \textit{melä or meilä, döimä}).

Söderberg (1879), Noreen (1904), Wessén (1968), Bandle (1973), Haugen (1976)

9. OGu. ī, of various origins, often corresponds with OIcel., OSw. ē: \textit{sīa str vb 'to see', vīr pron 'we'} (OIcel. \textit{sjá, vér}; OSw. \textit{sē, vīr}; Gu. \textit{säi, vör}).

Söderberg (1879), Wessén (1968), Haugen (1976)

10. Breaking of PGmc. *e, which is stronger in the east (Bandle 1973, 52ff.), is especially strong in Gutnish, where the original outcome ia eventually fronted to ie (Gu. jā): \textit{mielk fem 'milk', iek pron 'I', ieta str vb 'to eat'} (OIcel. \textit{mjǫlk, ek, eta}; OSw. \textit{miølk, iak, æta}). Gutnish does not distinguish between a-breaking (OIcel. jā; OSw. ia) and u-breaking (OIcel. jp; OSw. ip or io) except in long stems (Pipping [1905-07], lxxviii-lxxix; see also Hesselman 1945, 63): \textit{iorþ fem (OIcel. jörð; OSw. iorþ; Gu. járd)}.

Bandle (1973), Haugen (1976)

11. East Norse breaking of *y (from *i) > iū before *ngw, *nkw, and *ggw (cf. Bandle 1973, 54-55) does not occur in Gutnish: \textit{singua str vb 'to sing', stìnqua str vb 'to leap up'} (OIcel. \textit{syngva or syngja, stökva}; OSw. \textit{siūnga, stinka or stünkə or stinka}; Gu. \textit{singgä, sinkä}).

\footnote{Note e.g. OGu. fē neut 'cattle; moveable property' < PGmc. *fēhu-, rétr adj 'right; straight' < *rehta- (OIcel. fë, rétr; OSw. fē, rētr; Gu. fā, retar) speak against a “raising” of *ē > i in Old Gutnish (see also Vrieland 2015).}
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Wessén (1968), Haugen (1976)

12. OGu. hier adv ‘here’ (OIcel. hér; OSw. hār; Gu. jār) shows the diphthonization or breaking of PGmc. *ē₂.\(^{18}\) Breaking is also found in 3 sg pres ier, pl ieru ‘is, are’ as variant forms of ir, iru (OIcel. er, eru; OSw. ēr, ēro; Gu. jār, jāro).\(^{19}\)

Söderberg (1879), Noreen (1904), Bandle (1973), Schulte (2002)

13. Word-initial *y is lost before r: raði rem ‘anger, wrath’ (OIcel. reiði, OSw. vrēþe).\(^{20}\)

Söderberg (1879), Noreen (1904), Haugen (1976), Schulte (2002)

14. Feminine n-stems take the gen sg ending -ur (from PGmc. -ōnaz): festur ‘pledge’, kyrkiur ‘church’, (OIcel. festu, kyrku; OSw. fæstu, kirkio).\(^{21}\)

Noreen (1904), Wessén (1968)

15. An early pres stem of the modal verb ‘shall’ lacks sk-: 3 sg pres al, skal, pl ulu, skulu (OIcel. skal, skulu; OSw. skal, skulu or skula; Gu. skall, skulo).

Noreen (1904), Wessén (1968)

Further differences between Old Gutnish and the other Old Nordic languages are especially found in the lexicon. A few Gutnish words have been loaned from a Baltic language (Säve 1859, xxx; Bugge 1877-1878, 156), including OGu. klēti neut ‘shed’ (cf. Lithuanian klė́tis, Latvian klēts) and Gu. māsuā or māusa fem ‘fly (insect)’ (cf. Lithuanian mūsė or mūsia, Latvian mūsa or mūsa).

A well-known semantic difference is lamb neut, which means ‘(adult) sheep’ in Old Gutnish, as in Gothic, whereas cognates in the remaining Germanic languages all mean ‘lamb, young of a sheep’. This and other apparent similarities with Gothic have led some scholars to argue for an East Germanic connection or substrate in Gutnish (e.g. Bugge 1877-1878, 148-158). While the aim of the present study is not to take up this discussion, it should be noted that most apparent connections are either common archaisms or the outcomes of distinct processes (cf. Vrieland 2017, 790).

\(^{18}\) Sometimes called “Birka” diphthonization or breaking; cf. Widmark (1994).

\(^{19}\) Separate plural verbal endings are only found on Fårö (Gustavson 1977, 34).

\(^{20}\) No modern descendant of OGu. raði is known. Occasionally initial *ur hardened to br, though examples are only known from Modern Gutnish, e.g. bra̯dā str vb ‘to twist’ (OIcel. rída; OSw. vriža); cf. Gustavson (1948, 162-163).

\(^{21}\) Only preserved in frozen expressions, e.g. til körkur ‘to church’ (Säve 1859, xv).
1.2.3 The Normalization of Old Gutnish

As with Old Swedish and Old Danish, Old Gutnish lacks a standard for normalization. In her edition of *Guta saga*, Peel (1999, lx) informs her reader that she has “normalised, or more strictly standardised, to the most common usage in the manuscript,” a practice which led Mitchell (2002, 1377) to ask: “to what?” While one may indeed be critical of Peel’s “various silent emendations” (Mitchell 2002, 1387), her standardization of the language is nevertheless largely consistent. Peel neutralizes vocalic variation in unstressed lexemes, writing e.g. *miþ* for *miþ*, *meþ*; *et* for the conjunction *at*, *et*. She omits superfluous graphemes such as *c* and *j*, opting instead for *k* and *i* in all instances; *v* indicates word-initial /u̯/ only, with all other instances of /u̯/ and /u/ being rendered ⟨u⟩. On the other hand, Peel preserves the equally superfluous *qu*, *x*, *z* to represent the clusters /ku̯ ks ts/.

One also finds a few inconsistencies in Peel’s standardization practice, due in part to the limited corpus. For example, she spells OGu. *borg* ‘fortress’ as *burg* but the settlement of Torsburgen as *Þorsburg*. Peel furthermore attempts to resolve a heavily debated form *staþr, steþr* ‘city, place’ by positing the umlauted variant in the *ACC PL steþi* only, rendering the *ACC SG* and *DAT SG* as *staþ*, although ⟨steþ⟩ occurs in the manuscript as well.

Despite these minor details, Peel’s edition of *Guta saga* is the first intentional attempt at standardizing the orthography of this marginally attested language. In her dissertation on *Guta lag*, Peel (2006, 56-57) further describes some specifics of her “normalized, or more strictly standardized” (2006, 55) presentation of the language. In the present work, I will adhere to an orthographical standard based off that begun by Peel (1999, 2006), which I have further adapted and developed, to the best of my ability, to be consistent and accurate to the language found in the Old Gutnish manuscripts. The main principles of this orthographical standard are outlined below:

Long vowels are indicated with a macron ā ē ī ō ū ȳ in order to distinguish from the short vowels a e i o u y.

The diphthongs are written ai au oy and the characteristic triphthong iau.

The weak vowels in non-root syllables are spelled a i u, e.g. *NOM PL dagar, DAT SG dagi, DAT PL dagum* ‘day’.

When /a/ alternates with /e/ in root syllables, both forms are given, with *a* first, e.g. *fat, fet* ‘that’. Similarly, both forms are given for alternating /i/ and /e/, with *i* first, e.g. *miþ, meþ* ‘with’.

---

22Peel notes the following: “(1) *c* in the manuscripts has been rendered as *k* throughout; (2) *ch* has been rendered as *k*, *gh* as *g*; (3) *w* has been rendered as *v* if consonantal but as *u* if vocalic; (4) *u* has been rendered as *v* if consonantal, but as *u* if vocalic, although *hu* and *su* have been retained” (Peel 2006, 56).
The semivowel /i/ is not distinguished from its vocalic counterpart /i/, e.g. *bɪ̯fa ‘to pray’.

The semivowel /u/ is distinguished from its vocalic counterpart /u/ in word-initial position, being spelled v, e.g. vī ‘holy place’. Initial /ku̯/ is spelled qu as is most common in the manuscripts, e.g. *que̯pa ‘to say’. Furthermore, a distinction is kept between /u̯/, spelled vu, and /f/ [β], spelled f, e.g. *sta̯fuar ‘landing place’, hafa ‘to have’.

The velar stops are always spelled k and g where the manuscripts often have ⟨c ch⟩ and ⟨gh⟩, e.g. skulu ‘shall’, dagar ‘days’.

The dental fricative is spelled þ in all positions, e.g. aþr ‘oath’.

The consonant cluster /ks/ is spelled x, e.g. siex ‘six’, while z is used to indicate the cluster /ts/, e.g. vaizla ‘reception, entertainment’ < *waiťa-slōn-. These spellings do not apply, however, to the genitive ending -s, e.g. gen sg lands ‘land’.

All Old Gutnish lexemes cited in the present work are furthermore found in the glossary following these principles for normalization.

1.3 The Corpus of Old Gutnish

Gutnish fills a unique role among the Nordic languages as the only non-standard language variety “som kan sägas ega en historia” (Säve 1859, iii) [that can be said to have a history]. Though scant, the medieval corpus of Gotland is by no means insignificant and covers a variety of literary genres, including legal language, narrative prose, elegy, and alliterative poetry. Codex B only contains one of these texts, the law code *Guta lag*, though the present study draws comparative material from the remainder of the corpus, as outlined below.

1.3.1 Guta lag

As with other regions in the Nordic world, Gotland was governed by a set of orally transmitted laws eventually codified and put to parchment in the late Middle Ages. Containing around 14 000 words, *Guta lag* is the longest surviving text in Old Gutnish and the most important source of information on the language and societal structure of Medieval Gotland. The text survives in four manuscript recensions in a total of seven manuscripts. Only two recensions are preserved in the original Old Gutnish language, here referred to as recension α, only known from Codex A, and recension β, known from Codex B and its two descendant manuscripts Copenhagen, Royal Library, GKS 3363 4to (B₁) and Copenhagen, Royal Library, Kall
650 4to (B₂). The remaining recensions are only preserved in translation. Recension γ is found in a single parchment manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, B 65 (G), containing a German translation from 1401. Recension δ consists of the Danish translation found in two manuscripts: the sixteenth-century paper manuscript Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 55 4to (D) and its descendant Stockholm, Royal Library, B 68 (D₁).

While some provisions in Guta lag must stem back to an oral customary law, the codified law text likely dates to the early thirteenth century. Anders Sunesen, the archbishop of Lund from 1201-1228 who visited Gotland in 1207 and had a keen interest in the provincial laws of Denmark, was likely the driving force behind the codification of Guta lag. In a letter dated sometime between 1216 and 1223 Sunesen writes:

Legem enim (vt Isidorus ait) loco et patriæ conuenire conuenit. Hinc est quod insula Gothlandiae, sicut longo maris tractu ab alijs terris separatur, sic illius incolæ in iure posituo et consuetudinario tam secular quam Ecclasiastico ex magna parte variantur ab alijs populis. (SDHK 2013, no. 350)

[Thus law (as Isidorus asserts) is suitably fitted to place and country. So it is with the island of Gotland: just as it is dragged far out in the sea and separated from other lands, so are its people in positive and customary law, both secular and ecclesiastical, for the great part different from other peoples.]

In the preceding sentence, Sunesen notes that every country has its own laws (“suas ac varias leges habeat”), which Holmbäck and Wessén (1979, lxxii) consider sufficient evidence that a written law code had not yet existed. The codification of Guta lag must then post-date this letter, though still within the time Anders Sunesen held office, thus at some point in the 1220s.

Other theories regarding the dating of Guta lag are laid out in Peel (2015, 21-25). Each of these theories has its own merit and is more a question of how to define ‘codification’ or exactly what version of Guta lag is meant. Säve (1859, x) argues for an early date of composition (twelfth century or earlier) on the basis of language, explicitly referring to the oldest sections or provisions of Guta lag (“Guta Lags äldsta del”). Meanwhile Schlyter (1852, ix) contends Guta lag cannot be older than the latter half of the thirteenth century based on the provision regarding non-Gotlandic women’s inheritance. This seems to argue for a more finalized version of the law.

23 These manuscripts are all described in greater detail in Chapter 2 and listed in Appendix A.
24 Codex A states “En vm ogutnisc fulc þa liauti|n tuar systrir gin ainu m|bryþr” A 29r8-9 [And regarding non-Gotlandic people, then two sisters inherit as one brother]. Schlyter (1852, ix) interprets ogutnisk ‘non-Gotlandic’ here as referring to Swedes living in the countryside (as opposed to, for example, Germans living in Visby), and argues this provision to be a Gotlandic response to Birger Jarl’s law of inheritance, namely that it only applies to Swedes. It thus follows that Guta lag must post-date this legislation, leading Schlyter (1852, ix) to a dating in the late thirteenth century.
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text or, in the words of Jacobsen (1910, 80 fn. 1), “sin endelige Redaktion” [its final recension]. Dating the codification of Gutlag to the 1220s does not exclude either of these assertions; some provisions clearly predate the thirteenth century, tracing back to oral customary law, while others are clearly younger, having been added after the original codification.

Similarities to other Nordic laws
Immediately apparent in the format of Gutlag is the lack of structure; the text is not divided into b Falkar ('books' or 'parts', literally 'beams') as the Swedish provincial laws, and the order of individual statutes seems at times haphazard. This apparent disorder leads Peel (2015) to argue the text to be what Westman (1941, 14-15) refers to as a rättsbok, a written record of the local laws, rather than a lagbok, a complete and unified lawbook:

\[\text{Gutlag} \text{ could therefore be described as a selective record by an individual or individuals of the law in force in Gotland at a particular moment, amended and copied at various times to give rise to the preserved manuscripts; in other words, it is more a justice book } \text{rättsbok} \text{ than a statute book } \text{lagbok}. \] (Peel 2015, 11)

Wessen (1945, xix), on the other hand, argues for the opposite: “[Gutlag] är en verklig lagbok, d.v.s. den innehåller en formligen antagen och stadfäst text, som har haft normativ kraft” [Gutlag is a true lawbook, that is to say it contains a formally adopted and ratified text which had had normative power]. In this way, argues Wessen (1945), Gutlag differs from e.g. Äldre Västgotalagen and Östgotalagen, both considered rättsböcker by Westman (1941, 15). Notably, and in stark contrast to the reasoning given by Peel (2015, 11), these two laws are arranged into b Falkar.

Structurally Gutlag resembles the Danish provincial laws, e.g. Skånske lov, where related items are grouped together in small chapters, often with a chapter heading. This similarity in format may, at least in part, be attributed to the similar origins of these two law codes, if indeed both were instigated by Anders Sune-sen of Lund. Schildener (1818, xxviiif.), on the other hand, finds the arrangement of Gutlag lends itself to division in b Falkar, even though no explicit headings or other division markers are found in the manuscripts. The discussion in § 2.1 follows Schildener’s proposed sections for Gutlag.

Similarities between Gutlag and medieval Norwegian laws have been pointed out by Schlyter (1852, vi-vii), Wessen (1945, xx), and (Peel 2015, 19-21), and there are clear indications of Norwegian influence on the Gutnish text. A comparison of the preface in Gutlag with the Norwegian Gulabingslog shows just how similar the two texts are in phrasing:
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*Guta lag*: Þittir er fyrst upphað í lagum orum: þet vir skulum naikka haiðnu ok áttta kristnu, ok trúa allir á ann guþ allsvaldanda. Ok hann þar biðja þet hann unni oss ár ok friþ, sigr ok hailsu, ok þet et vir magin halda kristindómi orum ok trú vári reþtri ok landi öru bygdu. Ok vir magin huern dag þet síysla í allum gjerningum, ok víla orum, sum guþi sêi dyrþ í, ok oss sêi mest þarf at béþi til lífs ok síálar. (A 2r3-15, normalized)

[This is the first beginning in our laws: that we shall renounce heathendom and accept Christianity, and all believe in one God Almighty, and bid him that he grant us prosperity and peace, victory and health, and that we may retain our Christianity, and our right faith, and our inhabited land, and we may carry that our every day in all our doings and our desires, in which God is honored and which we most need, both in body and soul.]

*Gulaþingslǫg*: Þat er upphaf laga varra at ver scolom luta austr oc biðia til hins helga Crist ars oc friþar. oc þess at vér halldem lande varo bygðu. oc lánar drotne varom helium. se hann vinr varr. en ver hans. en guð se allra varra vinr. (Keyser and Munch 1846-95, I, 1)

[This is the beginning of our laws: that we shall bow eastward and pray to the Holy Christ for prosperity and peace, and that we may retain our inhabited land and our king in health. May he be our friend, and we his, and may God be a friend to us all.]

Further similarities are especially evident in the church section of *Guta lag*. The seven chapters following the preface all begin with a variant of the phrase *Þet ier nû þî nest* [This is now next], frequently found in *Gulaþingslǫg* as *Þat er nú því nǽst*. The chapter regarding the raising of children closely parallels another Norwegian law, *Eiðsivaþingslǫg*, in the first two provisions:

*Guta lag*: Þet ier nû þî nest at barn huert skal ala sum fyrt verþr á landi öru ok ekki út kasta. Vita skal hueriun kuna seng sîna þå en hân í barn farum liggr. (A 2r16-2v1, normalized)

[This is now what follows, that every child, who is born in our land, shall be raised and not cast out. Every woman shall know her (own) bed when she lies in labor.]

*Eiðsivaþingslǫg*: ala skal barn huært. er boret uæðr. oc manz houuð er a. þo at nockor styrkymbli se a. oc ængu spilla. Sina sæng for skal huær kona uita. (Keyser and Munch 1846-95, I, 375)

[Every child, who is born and has a man’s head, though some blemish be on it, shall be raised and none spoiled. Every woman shall know her (own) birthing bed.]
Norwegian influence on another Eastern Scandinavian law code, Hälsingelagen, has been discussed by Brink (2014). Central to his claim are vocabulary items not found elsewhere in Swedish law, which can either be found in Norwegian law or otherwise argued to be loaned from the west. Two such items are also found in Guta lag:

1. OGu. *vereldi* is used for the compensation amount for a murder, based on one’s rank. Holmbäck and Wessén (1979b, 250; 1979c, 355-6) consider this and the corresponding *værold* from Hälsingelagen to be loans from West Germanic (OE wergild, OFris. wergeld, werield, OHG wergelt), though Brink (2014, 44-45) specifies Old English as the most likely candidate for the form in Hälsingelagen, noting further that “the natural background for this word would be Old Norwegian, and Old Norse legal and ecclesiastical language, which has many Old English loanwords”. Phonetically, the Old Gutnish term could only derive from Old English or Old Frisian, where palatal *g* develops into a glide [j]; of the two, Old English is the more likely candidate. Further significant is the formation and declension of the Old Gutnish term, which has been reanalyzed as a *ja*-stem compound of the type *at-mēli* (OIcel. *at-mæli*). Ekwall (1904, 49) includes both *vereldi* and *værold* as examples of this type of compound, though the latter example is less clear; the only attestation in Hälsingelagen lacks both an ending -i and i-umlaut typical of this formation.

2. OGu. *vaizla* appears once in Guta lag in the compound *vaizlurøl*, referring to a feast. Related to ONorw., OIcel. *veizla* (Icel. *veisla*), the form is found in Hälsingelagen as *væzla*, which Brink (2014, 49) notes “only occurs here in the Old Swedish laws”. The presence of the etymon in Guta lag need not speak for Norwegian influence on the Gutnish text, however, as the meanings differ. ONorw. *veizla*, in a legal context, specifically refers to the reception due the king upon his visit, which is also the meaning in Hälsingelagen. The Gutnish term, on the other hand, refers in general to a reception or party, which is also the meaning preserved in Icel. *veisla*.

Norwegian influence on Hälsingelagen is not unthinkable, considering the proximity of Norrland (the area under jurisdiction) to Norway. Western influence on Gotland, on the other hand, is surprising. Schlyter (1852, vii) notes the visit of St. Olaf to the island in the eleventh century would have given the Gotlanders an influence from Norway.

---

25 An earlier (Swedish) version of the same article (Brink 2010) mentions the Old Gutnish form and Guta lag, which has curiously been removed in the later version.

26 Note that the pronunciation of En. *wergild* with [g] is influenced by the spelling.

27 “En huer sum obuðin cum[br] til bryllaups eþa waizlur ols þa giel[di iii oyra]” A 28v13; [And anyone who comes uninvited to a wedding or feast then pays 3 oyir].
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sight into Norwegian law, though true influence on *Guta lag* must have been closer to the codification.

Validity of *Guta lag*

While *Guta lag* was codified at a time when the Gotlanders seem to have asserted their independence from the mainland, it remained the law of the land for the entire duration of Danish control over the island. [Westman (1941), 19] notes a failed attempt by Christian IV to instate *Skånske lov* in place of the Gotlandic law in 1595. In his ordinance, the king states:

> menige vore undersotter paa vort land Gotland skulle aldelis herepter hafve denom at rette epter dend skonske loug, men saa vit som recessen formelder och adviser, skulle de denom herepter rette och forholde. ([Secher 1887-1918, II, 693])

> [All our subjects on our land Gotland should completely hereafter be regulated by the Scanian law, but that which the ordinance contains and shows, they should be regulated by and keep.]

[Wessén (1945), xxv] considers the ordinance discussed in the letter to now be missing, though in [Secher (1887-1918, II, 693)] reference is made to the so-called Koldingske reces from 1558 (published in [Secher 1887-1918, I, 1-50]). What is clear, however, is that the imposition of *Skånske lov* on the Gotlanders did not go as easily as hoped. A new set of ordinances from 1618 (published in [Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia 1849, 359-397]) outlines the king’s disappointment in his previous attempt at legislation:

> Och samme hans Kong: Maijtzs: forordninger, dog iche endnu Indtill denne tidt er bleffuen holdeth och effterkommet. ([Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia 1849, 362])

> [And the same his Royal Majesty’s ordinances, though which still until this time are not being held and observed.]

It is thus unclear whether the Danish king was ever successful in imposing *Skånske lov* on the island, though only a few decades later, in 1645, Gotland would come under the Swedish crown as a result of the Treaty of Brömsebro. By the following year, *Guta lag* was fully replaced by Swedish national law ([Holmbäck and Wessén 1979b, lxxxviii]).

Thus for the majority of the period from the thirteenth to the seventeenth century when *Guta lag* was in force on the island, Gotland belonged to the Kingdom of Denmark, though was heavily influenced by Germany as well. This becomes apparent in the survival of *Guta lag* both in Old Gutnish and in translation; no Swedish translation of the law text is known from the manuscript tradition.
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Danish ordinances from 1492 and 1537

During the period of Danish rule over Gotland, while *Guta lag* was still in effect, two Danish kings added supplementary ordinances to the law. The first was drafted in 1492 by King John (Da. *Kong Hans*; r. 1481-1513), who sent a team of councilmen and a bishop to the island to issue the ordinances. The preface specifically mentions “then gamble Gudlandz lough” (Schlyter 1852, 219) [the old law of Gotland], to which “disse Effterschreffne Artickler, och puncter” (1852, 219) [these following written articles and points] should be appended.

The second set of ordinances was issued by Christian III (r. 1534-1559) in 1537. Both sets of ordinances are written in Danish and are found together in the manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, C 81, the only known complete copy. An incomplete copy is also known, copied by David Bilefeld and placed after the German translation of *Guta lag* in B 65 (§2.2.2).

City and Maritime Laws of Visby

Medieval Visby was an international center for trade during the Hanseatic period; its inhabitants were a mixture of native Gotlanders and foreign merchants, mostly German. The city’s unique status meant it was governed by separate legislation, *Visby Stadslag* [City Law of Visby]. The fourteenth-century manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, B 63 preserves what may be the original copy of the law, having once belonged to the Visby city hall (Hasselberg 1976, 166). Although the manuscript is written in German rather than Gutnish, the preface stipulates the law was to be written in both languages. Schlyter (1853, vi-vii) questions whether the Gotlandic version of the law ever existed, considering it should have been together with B 63 in the city hall, for which there is no evidence.

Two fragments of a similar text are known from the thirteenth century and may represent an earlier form of the Visby law (Schlüter 1907). Again, the language is German, and there is no evidence for a Gotlandic version having ever existed, or even considered, as the preface claims the need for a law for those “dhat sic in dheme namen godes begunde to versamende uppe gotlande dhydesch tunghe” (Schlüter 1907, 492) [of the German tongue, who in the Name of God began to gather on Gotland].

In addition to the city law, a set of maritime legal provisions, *Visby Sjörätt* [Maritime Law of Visby], is known in German, Dutch, Danish, and French (Schlyter 1853). Unlike *Guta lag* and *Visby Stadslag*, the contents of *Visby Sjörätt* are neither native nor specific to Gotland, but are instead taken from the maritime laws of other centers of trade, namely Lübeck, Amsterdam, and Bruges, and repurposed for the Baltic island.
1.3.2 Guta saga

Gotland is also home to “one of the few samples of original, non-legal prose from the [Old East Scandinavian] area” (Mitchell 1984, 151), namely the pseudo-historical narrative of the island, its foundation, Christianization, and subjugation to Sweden known as Guta saga. This short narrative – approximately 1800 words in length – is known mostly from an Old Gutnish version found in A following Guta lag on fols. 43r-50v ([2.2.1]. An incomplete copy of the text in Codex A, from which the episode of the conversion of Gotland by St. Olaf is notably missing, is found in the seventeenth-century paper manuscript, Bergen, Universitetsbibliotek, UBB Ms. 58. In addition to the Gutnish version is a full translation into German, found at the end of Guta lag in G; an Old Swedish fragment in the manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, D 2; and two fragments in Danish in the manuscripts Copenhagen, Royal Library, NKS 408 8vo and Copenhagen, Royal Library, GKS 2414 4to (see Ljunggren 1959).

It is clear from the text itself that Guta saga is not the work of a single author, but rather the compilation of oral traditions and historical knowledge related by a later redactor. Early sections include the founding and hallowing of the island by Þieluar, and the birth of the triplets Guti, Graipr, and Gunnfiaun, from whom all Gotlanders descend. These early sections show traces of oral tradition, including older linguistic forms (al ‘shall’ for later skal), and alliterative verse:

\[
\text{Alt ir baugum bundit} \\
\text{bölund al þitta varþa} \\
\text{ok fāum þrīa syni aiga. (A 43r16-17, normalized)}
\]

[Everything is bound with rings; this shall become inhabited land, and we shall have three sons.]

The youngest section of Guta saga (apart from possible interpolations scattered throughout the narrative), crucial for dating the narrative as a whole, describe political connections to Sweden reminiscent of the late thirteenth century. As noted above (§1.1), in 1285 Magnus Ladulås imposed an annual levy on the Gotlanders, alluding to a previous law and custom of either joining on military expeditions or paying a tax. A description of the previous state of affairs is paralleled in the final chapter of Guta saga:

---

28 The title Guta saga, though somewhat misleading considering the narrative’s length and place of origin, is the most commonly used and accepted name for the tale, having been first used by Säve (1852, 1859); cf. also Mitchell (2014, 157 fn. 7).

29 This manuscript has not been included in previous scholarship of Guta saga. It was catalogued by Jeff Love as a part of the project Stories for all time: The Icelandic fornaldarsögur (2012-2015).
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Then the Gotlanders have the choice to go, if they wish, with their warships and eight weeks' supplies and no more. If the Gotlanders are unable to follow, then they pay forty marks in coin per warship, though the year after, and not the same year it was requested. This is called laifingslami.

The lack of mention of Magnus Ladulås' taxation – or, for that matter, the increase of this tax in 1313 by his son, Birger Magnusson – has been given as argumentation for 1285 as a terminus ante quem for Guta saga.

Yet the nature of the text, both in language and content, speaks for a later dating of Guta saga. It is clear, as Mitchell (1984, 173-74) claims, that “the compiler of [Guta saga] was also a propagandist: he wanted to create an historical overview of the island that would demonstrate its ‘traditional’ independence.” Independence, that is, from Sweden. Neither Denmark nor any Dane are mentioned in Guta saga, a gap in content which would be striking if the text were compiled in the mid-thirteenth century, in the wake of Danish (especially ecclesiastical) influence on the island. Furthermore, there are clear indications that Gotland was autonomous during this period, at least in regards to trade: Albert of Riga (ca. 1165-1229), who allegedly founded the city together with Gotlandic merchants in 1201, declared the city’s monetary standard should be based on Gotlandic coinage; this standard was re-confirmed in 1305 by Archbishop Friederich von Pernstein (†1341), indicating the Gotlanders continued to use their own coinage. Trade privileges given to Gotlandic merchants by Henry III of England in 1237 and Magnus Ladulås of Sweden in 1276 further indicate an autonomous Gotland when dealing with trade. The need for a propagandist, nation-building narrative must then post-date Magnus Ladulås' decree from 1285.

1.3.3 Runic Corpus

Nearly 400 runic inscriptions have been found on stones and other objects scattered about Gotland, spanning a chronological period from the third century AD through

30 First given by [author] (1874, 117), and later supported by e.g. Pipping (1905-07, ii), Läffler (1908, 142), Wessen (1943, xviii, xxxiv), and less explicitly Peel (2015, 267-9).

31 “Ejusdem valoris erunt Rigenses denarii, cuius et Guthenses, licet alterius formee” ([author] Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia 1848, 2).

32 “Monetam autem in ciuitate fieri cuiuscunque forme, sit in potestate Domini Episcopi, dum tamen eiusmod bonitatis sit et ponderis, cuius est moneta Gothorum” ([author] Handlingar rörande Skandinaviens historia 1848, 13).
the Reformation. Fourteen runic items date to the Early Runic period (Snædal 2002 Urnordisk, 3rd-6th cent.), some of which — G 269 (Mos lancehead, 3rd cent.), G 98 (Etelhem brooch, late 5th or early 6th cent.), G 121 (Gurfile bracteate, ca. 500) — have been argued by some to be East Germanic rather than North Germanic (see Peterson 1998). Viking Age inscriptions are relatively fewer on Gotland than on the Swedish mainland, numbering only fifteen (two of which, †G 186 and †G 187, are lost); this is partly due to the proliferation of the so-called picture stones (Sw. bildstenar), for which Gotland is famous, which date from this period. Although the majority of them contain no text, six picture stones bear Viking Age inscriptions (cf. Snædal 2002, 48-53).

Also included in the runic corpus of Gotland are two calendars, though unfortunately both of the originals are lost. The elder of the two, supposedly dating to 1328, is known from the Danish physician and early runologist Ole Worm (1588-1684), who printed the calendar in his work Fasti Danici (published in 1626 and again in 1643). Worm’s own handwritten copy of the calendar survives today in the manuscript Copenhagen, Royal Library, NKS 203 8vo. The calendar fills twenty pages in the manuscript, starting with each of the twelve months of the year, followed by four pages of instructions on calculating the dates of Easter, Advent, the Ember Days, and the six ages of the world, all written in runes with transliterations above. The final four pages contain an Easter table, solar and lunar cycles, and an explicit, followed by two amulets against sudden death (moti braðum tauða) and water (moti uatni).

The younger of the two calendars is purported to date from 1527, and survives only in fragments in the Swedish bishop Jöran Wallin’s (1644-1723) handwritten work Analecta Gothlandensia Walliniana (Stockholm, Royal Library, Acc 1989/47). The fragments are found only on pages 657-672, which are out of their proper order, in the 980-page second volume of the Analecta (which fills a total of six volumes and two portfolios), and are interspersed with saints’ names and other notes. A glossary of dialect terms is found on page 659, containing such glosses as siau - septem ‘seven’ and Jaul - fest. Nat. ‘Christmas’. Wallin was furthermore aware of Johan Hadorph’s edition of Guta lag, which he references on page 657. Facsimiles of both calendars are published in Lithberg and Wessén (1939).

1.3.4 Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild

One final pre-Reformation Gutnish text survives, though unfortunately only in copies dating from the seventeenth century. The text, barely more than 500 words in length, contains the statutes of a fraternity dedicated to St. Catherine of Alexandria († ca. 305) and founded 1443 by Botulf, priest of Björke parish in Gotland.

33“Yfru Mariŭ Meßŭ, Gothl. Lag. Cap LIX. vbi Hadorph” [the later Feast of the Virgin Mary, Guta lag Chapter 59 in Hadorph].
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The Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild (StSC) contain rules of conduct for fraternity members, including monetary penalties for misconduct.

No original manuscript of the statutes survives; the earliest attestation of the document is a copy in Haqvin Spelg’s Rudera Gothlandica from 1683 (published in Wennersten [1901]). A later copy is found in J. Schoumacher’s dissertation De Gothlandia which formed the basis of Jörn Wallin’s copy in his posthumously published work Gothländska Samlingar (see Pernler [1986, Wallin [1747]). An edition of Schoumacher’s version, with variant readings from Spelg’s given in a critical apparatus, is given in Pernler (1986, 70-71).

The language of the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild is clearly Gutnish, although much younger than that of Guta lag or Guta saga as found in Codex A. However, the text is nearly contemporary with the exemplar manuscript of Codex B, making this an invaluable source of comparative material for the present study.

1.3.5 Gutnish today

Gutnish is still spoken today on Gotland and Fårö, though influenced to differing degrees by Standard Swedish to the point that it may be possible to distinguish a Gutnish language from a Gotlandic dialect of Swedish. The language (or dialect) is known variously as gutniska ‘Gutnish’ or gotländska ‘Gotlandic’, or by the name gutamål ‘Gotlanders’ language’, a term first coined by Carl Säve (Gustavson [1977, 7). To avoid ambiguity, the language variety spoken on Gotland and Fårö which can be traced directly back to Old Gutnish will in the present work be referred to as Modern Gutnish, abbreviated ‘Gu.’ Dialect variation in Modern Gutnish exists, though not considerable; the most conservative dialect is spoken on Fårö (Hallberg 2002, 1701), and will often be cited separately in the present work.

Modern Gutnish inherited a number of characteristics from its medieval ancestor, such as the diphthongs ai, au, and oy in e.g. Gu. stain ‘stone’, daudar ‘dead’, häirä ‘to hear’ (OGu. stain, dauþr, hoyra); as well as the triphthong iau in e.g. di-aupar ‘deep’ (OGu. diaupr). Unlike mainland Swedish, Modern Gutnish preserves the plosives [g] and [k] (also in the cluster sk) before front vowels, e.g. gast ‘guest’ (Gu. [gest], Sw. [jest]). Modern Gutnish is furthermore the only Nordic language where the outcome of old long ā is unrounded, as seen in e.g. fa [fa:] ‘to obtain’ < OGu. fā (cf. Sw. fá [fo:], Icel. fá [fa:] etc.).

The remaining long vowels have developed into diphthongs in Modern Gutnish, with the exception of ē in some areas. Thus we find Gu. svāin ‘swine, pig’ < OGu. svīn, nöiar ‘new’ < nýr, āut ‘out’ < ût, ret or reit ‘right, law’ < rēt, skōgr. Short vowels have mostly maintained their quality, though are length-
enended in open syllables (after the diphthongization of long vowels; cf. Riad 2002a, 1108), e.g. Gu. akar [a kar] ‘acre’ < OGu. akr, lid [li: d] ‘joint’ < lpr. Original short u undergoes breaking to [juː] when lengthened (not indicated in spelling), as heard in the name the islanders call themselves, gute [ɡjuː tʦ] (pl gutar).

Modern Gutnish retains three genders, both in nouns and adjectives: en gåuar man, ain gåu kuna (kunå), ått gutt ban ‘a good man, a good woman, a good child’ (OGu. ann göþr mahr, ain göþ kuna, att gutt barn). Verbal morphology has been simplified in Modern Gutnish; traces of a 2 sg personal ending remain, especially in Fårö (for example dâu kanst ‘thou canst’), which also preserves a separate ending for the plural forms (Fårö ja fikk, vör fingo ‘I received, we received’; Gotland ja, vör fikk).

Early written accounts of Modern Gutnish include Haqvin Spegel’s work Rudera Gothlandica from 1683 (published in Wennersten 1901), which includes a short word-list of the language, and Lars Neogaard’s work Gautauminning from 1732. The latter contains an entire chapter titled Thet Gothlendska Tungomålet [The Gotlandic Language] (published in Wollin 2009), which contains around 2500 lexical entries together with a description of the grammar of Gutnish. While an invaluable resource, Neogaard’s word-list must be approached with caution, as it often conflates spoken Gutnish with Old Gutnish (as found in Guta lag and Guta saga), runic evidence, and Gothic (cf. Wollin 2009, 126; Gustavson 1940, x-xi). In the nineteenth century, the native Gotlander Carl Säve outlined the grammar of Gutnish in his Bemærkninger over Öen Gotland (Säve 1843) and, together with his elder brother Per Arvid Säve, compiled a collection of 28,000 Gotlandic words which would eventually be published as Gotländsk ordbok (Gustavson 1918-1945).

In 1945 an organization was founded to promote the language variety of Gotland and Fårö. Among the founders was Stockholm-born linguist Herbert Gustavson (1895-1986), whose normalization practices I follow in the present work. Today Gutamålsgilde continues to “främja forskningen kring och vården over det uråldriga gotländska språket – gutamål [...] och medverka till det nu levande språkets sunda utveckling och tillgänglighet för kommande generationer” (Gahnström and Wahlgren 2012) [promote research in and protection of the ancient Gotlandic language, Gutnish, and contribute to the living language’s healthy development and accessibility for future generations].

36Fårö ann.
37These practices include the vowels a e i o u y å á ø ò, of which all except ø can be long or short. Length is not indicated in the normalization but is given, when relevant, in a phonetic transcription. Diphthongs are spelled ai au åi äi öi and the triphthong jau. Velar [ŋ] is not kept distinct from [n]; palatal [ʃ] is spelled sj.
1.4. Previous scholarship

Scholarly interest in the Old Gutnish language and the texts *Guta lag* and *Guta saga* began in the seventeenth century with an edition of Codex A by the Swedish historian Johan Hadorph (1630-1693). In the edition [Hadorph (1687)] makes continuous reference to the German translation found in the manuscript B 65, which would appear a century and a half later in its own edition [Schildener (1818)], but makes no mention of Codex B. The younger manuscript, which was still in private hands at the time of Hadorph’s edition, would not appear in a scholarly publication until the middle of the nineteenth century.

1.4.1 Editions and manuscript studies

The first and to date only edition to include all known manuscripts of *Guta lag* was published in 1852 by the Swedish legal historian Carl Johan Schlyter (1795-1888) as part of his 13-volume series of the provincial laws of Sweden, *Samling af Sveriges gamla lagar*. Volume VII ([Schlyter, 1852]) may perhaps be more properly referred to as a collection of editions rather than a single edition, as it contains not only the Old Gutnish version of both *Guta lag* and *Guta saga*, together with a side-by-side translation into Swedish, but also the German version of both texts (pgs. 113-168), the Danish version of the law code (pgs. 169-218), as well as the Danish ordinances from 1492 (pgs. 219-227) and 1537 (pgs. 227-234). Furthermore, Schlyter includes the Old Gutnish lexical material in the final volume of his work ([Schlyter, 1877]), the first dictionary to incorporate Old Gutnish.

The strength of Schlyter’s editions can be found in their comprehensive presentation of the material. In the introduction ([1852, i-xx]), Schlyter provides codicological descriptions of eight manuscripts, six of which are used in the editions. Schlyter is furthermore the first to refer to the Old Gutnish manuscripts B 64 and AM 54 4to as ‘A’ and ‘B’, respectively – designations which, for better or worse, are standard practice today. Codex A forms the main text of the Old Gutnish edition, with Codex B in the critical apparatus. The two descendants of Codex B – GKS 3363 4to and Kall 650 4to – are discussed in the introduction, though [Schlyter (1852, xix)] finds no reason to include the variants found in these manuscripts (which for the most part are misreadings; cf. §2.1.2 and §2.1.3) in the critical apparatus.^[38]^[38] Volumes I-II (*Västgötalagen* and *Östgötalagen*, respectively) edited together with Hans Samuel Collin.

^[39]^[39] Peel (2015, 238) notes that “Schlyter was apparently unaware” of the Swedish translation of *Guta saga* (Stockholm, Royal Library, D 2), and neither does he include the Danish translations (NKS 508 8vo, GKS 2414 4to). Of course, we cannot be too critical of Schlyter not knowing about these manuscripts; the former was first described more than a decade later by Klemming (1867: 68, 243), though the contents were not printed until Ljunggren (1959). The Danish translations
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One criticism which can be given to Schlyter’s edition of the Old Gutnish material is his preference for Codex A over Codex B. Statutes from the younger codex which are not found in the older manuscript are placed at the end of the text as six ‘additamenta’ or within the critical apparatus (see e.g. 39 fn. 5, 41 fn. 63, 43 fn. 79, 60 fn. 41). This unfortunate displacement of older statutes removed from the α recension (cf. Holmbäck and Wessén [1979b, lxvff.]) is followed by Säve [1859, 36-39] and Peel [2013, 82-87], who also place them as additamenta.

Further criticism can be – and already has been – given to Schlyter’s presentation of the Old Gutnish language in Codex A. Schlyter [1852, vi] argues the language of Gutta lag is often grammatically incorrect, for which he receives heavy criticism from Säve [1859, xiv ff.]. Among the more grievous of Schlyter’s misunderstandings of Gutnish grammar, which Säve spends nearly four pages correcting (1859, xiv-xvii), is that “feminina tillägga efter u i gen. och dat. ofta r” (Schlyter 1852, iv) [feminines add r after ⟨gen⟩ and ⟨dat⟩ u]. As Säve [1859, xv] rightly points out, the ending -ur does not occur in the Dat sg, and is etymologically the expected Norse ending in the Gen sg of Fem n-stems.

Säve’s critique of Schlyter is found in the introduction to his own edition of Gutta lag and Gutta saga, which is a normalized version of the text taken from Schlyter [1852], with a critical apparatus giving readings from Codices A and B. Despite the normalized orthography (for example, /u/ is always spelled w), variation still exists within the text, such that both Nom sg mapr and mandr ‘man’ occur, or Gen pl neut fygura and fiugura ‘four’. This normalization becomes somewhat artificial in the chapters taken from Codex B, as it attempts to adapt both to the orthography of both manuscripts, as illustrated in the following interlinear gloss:

B Tha en han ey | wil Boot taka, vtan wil heldr hemp|na, tha skal hin bierra a Pa en hann ai will bot taka, utan will heldr hempna, þa skal hinn biera a tinh fyri|alla lydi, taki en tar en han wil, | ellar Radin their fyrir fe, oc mader | þing fyrri alla lyþi; taki en þar en hann will, ellar radin þair fyrir fe, ok mader si osaker. (6r1-6)
si osaker. (Säve 1859, 36)

‘If he does not wish to take compensation, but would rather avenge, then the other must bring this to the assembly before all the people; he may still accept it if he wishes, otherwise they take responsibility for the payment, and the man is blameless.’

Codex B came into the spotlight through the work of the Finland Swede (Knut) Hugo Pipping (1864-1944), who produced the first and to date only edition of the
younger manuscript (Pipping [1901]). Pipping delivers the manuscript text in a near-facsimile edition; nothing is emended, no abbreviations expanded, marginal notes are printed in the corresponding margins, above-line additions are given as superscripts, and all editorial marks (daggers, carons) are reproduced in the edition. Page breaks in the manuscript are marked clearly, complete with catchwords, although line breaks are not kept as in the manuscript. Tall ⟨ſ⟩ is kept distinct from round ⟨s⟩ in the text, which is printed using Fraktur typeface (a sign of the era in which it was produced, though a potential stumbling-block for the modern user). Likewise ⟨y⟩ is rendered þ with the same dots as in Bilefeld's script, although the bow over ⟨u⟩ is not indicated; Pipping indicates in a footnote, however, any time this bow or a dot above ⟨i⟩ is missing in the manuscript, as well as any (clear or possible) corrections made by Bilefeld in the manuscript.

This attention to detail in Pipping’s (1901) edition is praised in a review of the publication:

This edition has been executed in a most careful manner, the aim of the editor having been to give as true and complete a picture of the ms. as possible. He therefore refrains from emending the text, even such passages of the same as are evidently corrupt and easily corrected. Apparently we may use the edition with the same confidence as if we had the ms. itself before us, the slightest dot or line having been noted with the most painstaking accuracy. (Björkman 1905, 388)

Björkman goes on to note that, due to the limited attestation of the Old Gutnish language in general, such a facsimile edition is especially welcome, as “all conclusions to be drawn from the material offered by this special edition would better be drawn from the text in its actual shape than from an emendated text” (1905, 388).

A limitation of the edition is evident in a critique given by Björkman, though not in the way the reviewer intended. In a discussion of a token 3 sg pres doyr ‘dies’, Björkman (1905, 389) notes “[t]he spelling döyr is no doubt to be explained as an error for doyr”, assuming the scribe “had at first wrongly put the ğ- dots above the o”. Having only Pipping’s (1901) edition in hand, this is indeed a reasonable explanation. However, a look at the manuscript reveals the scribe intended a true ö- or ø-like vowel, as it is written with a single curved stroke rather than two dots, as Pipping (1905-07, lxxxix) later notes in a rebuttal. Nevertheless, the limitations of the typeface occasionally lead one to the wrong conclusion.

Following the edition Pipping (1901, 71-85) presents a study of various features of Codex B, including a discussion of the marginal notes and their possible exemplars (pgs. 73-75), discussions on the language (pgs. 76-80), and codicological features (pgs. 81-83). A final section (pgs. 87-134) contains a variety of linguistic observations from both Old and Modern Gutnish, a subject he resumed in a follow-up publication (Pipping 1904). His interest in the younger manuscript allowed
Pipping to resolve some linguistic issues in Old Gutnish, using e.g. the reading ⟨loyndir⟩ B 31r11 to explain the defective reading ⟨lyndir⟩ A 28r2 as OGu. *loyndir* fem pl ‘private parts’ (Olcel. *leynd* sg ‘secrecy’, [1901], 88-89) and ⟨Thia⟩ B 20v3 to explain Gu. *täiå* ‘toe’ as deriving from OGu. *tiå* ([1904], 10-12; §6.1.3).

In a follow-up edition of *Guta lag* and *Guta saga* ([1905-07]), using Codex A as a base text, Pipping incorporates the extra chapters from Codex B into the main text, a contrast to Schlyter (1852), who places these readings at the end. Pipping visually separates readings from B by using the same Fraktur typeface from the 1901 edition, whereas the A text is printed in Roman type. In the introduction Pipping discusses a number of linguistic differences between the two main codices (see §1.4.2), as well as between *Guta lag* and *Guta saga* in Codex A. Though extensive and detailed, Pipping’s linguistic discussions can be criticized on one point, namely the conflation of phonology and mere orthography, which will be made evident in the course of the present study. Finally, the edition ends with an extensive glossary of Old Gutnish as found in Codex A and supplemented with Codex B.

Pipping’s ([1905-07]) edition of *Guta lag* and *Guta saga* remains the standard edition, having sparked later studies such as a Danish translation of the text by Lis Jacobsen (1911), who further devotes half of the introduction (pgs. 12-18) to a discussion of language usage and age of the texts. Parts of *Guta saga* are also used (though with added macrons to indicate long vowels) as an introductory text in E. V. Gordon’s Old Norse textbook (Gordon and Taylor 1957, 175-177).

A facsimile of the Stockholm manuscripts A and G was published by Wessén (1945). The introduction, which briefly discusses Codex B (pg. xiii in Swedish and xxviii-xxxix in English), was reused in a Swedish translation of *Guta lag* and *Guta saga* (Holmbäck and Wessén 1979b). The translation includes the older layers of *Guta lag* from Codex B in their proper location in the text, indicated within the extensive endnotes (pgs. 244-290); on the other hand, chapters and provisions considered later additions to the text, whether they are found in A, B, or D, are placed at the end. Although a translation of the text, Holmbäck and Wessén’s (1979b) publication is an indispensable tool for understanding the *Guta lag* corpus in its entirety, as clarifications from the German and Danish translations are frequently given in the endnotes.

The first English translation of *Guta lag* was published by Peel (2009) and derives from the author’s Ph.D. dissertation (Peel 2006). Peel’s interest in Old Gutnish texts stems back to her MPhil. (1998), a translation of *Guta saga* which would be published the following year (1999) republished 2010. The two translations would eventually be published together as the first volume of an ongoing translation series of the Old Nordic laws (Peel 2015).

Peel’s (2006) dissertation includes not only a translation of *Guta lag* but also a transcription of the Old Gutnish text. Based on Pipping’s (1905-07) edition, Peel visually separates readings from Codex A and Codex B by using a serif (Times New
Roman) and sans serif (Arial) font, respectively. Chapters not found in Codex A are, however, given at the end of the text as addenda, following the practice first established by Schlyter (1852). The orthography is normalized, “or more strictly standardized, following the reading of the A-text” (Peel 2006, 55), including silent expansion of abbreviations. The Old Gutnish text (pgs. 58-101) is followed by a critical apparatus in the form of end-notes (pgs. 101-117) discussing the variants in the two Gutnish manuscripts and previous scholars’ readings (e.g. Schlyter 1852, Säve 1859, and Pipping [1905-07], but also Hadorph [1687]). Thereafter follows an English translation (pgs. 118-172) and a commentary on the text (pgs. 174-352) which, together with the introduction (pgs. 4-57), would form the basis of the later publications (Peel 2009; 2015). An English translation of Pipping’s [1905-07] glossary is given at the end of the dissertation (pgs. 353-441) before the various appendices.

1.4.2 Linguistic studies

In the introduction to his edition of the Guta lag manuscripts, Schlyter (1852, xii) devotes a few lines to the orthographic characteristics of Codex B, noting the lack of the grapheme ⟨Þ⟩, the use of ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩ for the diphthong ai, and the confusion of ⟨u⟩ and ⟨n⟩. Despite these small details, (Schlyter 1852, xii) concludes that, in general, the manuscript preserves the Old Gutnish language.

Säve (1859, ix-x) considers the language of Guta saga, together with the later additions to Guta lag, to be younger than the language in the rest of Guta lag in A. Codex B, notes Säve (1859), follows the language of these younger parts of A in e.g. the use of OGu. mangr ADJ ‘many’ instead of margr; vara STR VB ‘to be’ and varþa STR VB ‘to become’ instead of vera, verþa; 3 SG PRES ier, pl ieru ‘is, are’ instead of ir, iru.

Holmbäck and Wessén (1979b, lxv) succinctly conclude that the language of Codex B shows “en yngre prägel än språket i hs. A” [a younger touch than the language in Codex A).

Undoubtedly the most prolific scholar to discuss the language of Codex B is Hugo Pipping, whose studies include the edition of the manuscript followed by a number of linguistic observations (Pipping 1901) and a follow-up study of various linguistic features three years later, where Codex B plays a prominent role (Pipping 1904).

Chronological layers of the Old Gutnish language as seen in the corpus came into a central focus in Pipping’s edition of Guta lag and Guta saga (1905-07). Pipping lists nineteen linguistic features of Guta saga (including the final three chapters of Guta lag in Codex A) which distinguish the language of the saga text from the language of Guta lag in the elder codex (1905-07, viii-xi), as well as 26 ways the language of Codex B differs from that of Codex A (1905-07, lxxxvi-xcii).

As already noted by Säve (1859), these linguistic features of Codex B and Guta saga occasionally overlap. Of the features listed by Pipping (1905-07), we find the
following in common:

1. Orthographically Codex B resembles *Guta saga* in its use of initial ⟨w⟩ and broader use of ⟨k⟩ where Codex A typically uses ⟨u v⟩ and ⟨c⟩ in *Guta lag*. Initial /su̯/ is spelled ⟨sw⟩ in B only, as both texts in Codex A have ⟨su⟩ (§4.1.1 §4.1.2).

2. Both *Guta saga* and Codex B show the phonological lowering of үer > үar in e.g. *vera, vara* STR VB ‘to be’ (§4.3.8).

3. Contraction of 3 SG PRES *gierir* ‘does’ > *gier* is found in both *Guta saga* and Codex B (§5.1.3).

4. Both texts also show a preference for 3 SG PRES *ier*, PL *ieru* instead of *ir, iru* commonly found in *Guta lag* in A (§5.1.7).

5. Leveling of the paradigm *vār* PRON ‘our’ is seen in DAT SG NEUT *vāru* (ōru in A; §5.1.6).

6. OGu. *mangr* ADJ ‘many’ is used instead of *margr* (§6.2.4).

7. OGu. *ellar* ADV ‘otherwise’ is also used as a conjunction ‘or’ in both texts. In Codex B the conjunction is also found as *ella*, whereas *Guta saga* has *ēpha* as in *Guta lag* in A (§6.2.2).

8. The leveled NOM SG *mandr* for OGu. *maþr* MASC ‘man’ is not found in either *Guta saga* or Codex B, though the saga has one example of ACC MANDR *mann* used as a nominative.

9. Lowering of *i* > *e* before geminates in the possessive pronouns *minn, þinn, simn* is not found in *Guta saga*; Codex B shows more tokens with *i* than with *e*, aligning with the saga text (§4.2.4).

10. DAT SG NEUT *þī* (DEM PRON) is *þī* in *Guta saga*. In Codex B both forms are found.

Nevertheless, some features of Codex B are unique to the younger manuscript; the following listed by Pipping (1905-07) are not shared with *Guta saga*:

1. Long vowels are frequently written double, including ⟨w⟩ for ӯ (§4.3.5).

2. Consonants are more commonly written double in Codex B than in A, though the examples are mostly confined to ⟨ck⟩ for *k* after resonants (§4.1.1).

---

40As a feature of Codex A rather than Codex B, the use of *mandr* is not otherwise discussed in the present study.

41This feature is not otherwise discussed in the present study.
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3. The grapheme ⟨þ⟩ is missing from Codex B (with the exception of two tokens in marginalia). Initial /þ/ is written ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩, while internally /þ/ [ð] is written ⟨d⟩ or ⟨dh⟩ (§4.1.1; §4.3.2).

4. Word-internal /f/ [β] is written ⟨ff⟩ or ⟨ffu⟩ (§4.1.1).

5. Codex B writes word-internal /g/ [γ] as ⟨gh⟩ more often than Codex A; ⟨ngh⟩ is only found in B (§4.1.1).

6. The labial glide /u̯/ is often lost after velars (§4.1.2).

7. Codex B shows more epenthesis than Codex A, including mn > mpn, which is missing from the elder codex (§4.1.6).

8. The diphthong ai is written ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩ in Codex B (§4.3.4).

9. The graphemes ⟨æ⟩ and ⟨ø⟩ occur in a few tokens in B, being completely absent from A (§4.3.3).

10. Codex B has more examples of ⟨ia⟩ for the outcome of breaking (§4.2.3).

11. OGu. pianista fem ‘service’ and sial fem ‘soul’, which Pipping (1905-07, xc) argues contain a long diphthong iā, are spelled with ⟨ie⟩ in Codex B, which could be Danicisms (§4.3.1).

12. Codex B frequently writes ⟨o⟩ where Codex A has ⟨u⟩, both in stressed and unstressed positions (§4.2.4; §4.3.1).

13. Unstressed i is frequently written ⟨e⟩ in Codex B (§4.2.4).

14. The two codices differ in the svarabhakti vowel (§4.2.5).

15. The two codices differ as well in their vocabulary: Codex A eþa, Codex B ella ‘or’; A naicca, B neytha ‘to renounce, deny’; A al, ulu, B skal, skulu ‘shall’ (Chapter 6).

16. OGu. comp flairin ‘more’ is used as an attributive adjective in Codex B, whereas in Codex A it is only used predicatively; thus Codex A “flairi menn” A 39r7 [more men] but “þa en | synir karls iru flairin” A 21v12-13 [when the sons of a (free)man are more], Codex B “fleirin men” 50v13 and “Tha en synir karls | ieru fleirin” 24v6-7.

17. Codex B shows occasional loss of declination after prepositions: “till liif och siell” 112v12 [to body and soul]; Codex A “til lifes oc | sialar” A 2r14-15 (§5.2.2).

18. Danicisms in Codex B are not uncommon: ⟨hiem⟩ ‘home’ for haim (Da. hjem), ⟨mand⟩ ‘man’ for mabr, mann (Da. mand). Pipping (1905-07, xcii) considers the forms ⟨diupt⟩ ‘deep’, ⟨liuitir⟩ ‘obtains (by lot)’, and ⟨skiuter⟩ ‘shoots’ to be Swedicisms (§4.2.2; §4.3.1).

42 This feature is not otherwise discussed in the present study.
The idea of Danish influence on Codex B already appeared in Pipping’s (1901) earlier study of the manuscript, where he first suggested the scribe of the exemplar manuscript β1470 may have also been Danish:

Det danska inflytandet på den bildade klassen på Gotland gjorde sig naturligtvis starkt gällande även på 1400-talet, och den man, som skrifvit cod. 1470 [β1470], kan haft varit en dansk. (Pipping 1901, 73)

[Danish influence on the educated class on Gotland was, of course, strong in the 15th century as well, and the man who wrote β1470 may also been Danish.]

1.5 The Present Study

As an in-depth study of a single manuscript, the present work falls within the scope of various fields of discipline under the umbrella of philology, a term with nearly as many definitions as practitioners. Leaving a definition intentionally broad, I define philology as “the study of historical texts and the languages in which they are written”. Such a definition covers a multitude of disciplines, including textual criticism, historical linguistics, and material philology, all of which come into play in the present work.

The following section (§1.5.1) presents the theoretical frameworks which have guided the present study, together with their key concepts and caveats. Following these discussions on theory is a short description of the methods I have used to collect, organize, and present the data (§1.5.2). An outline of the following chapters is given in the final section (§1.5.3).

1.5.1 Theoretical frameworks

Material philology

Material philology⁴³ is the discipline that studies “the interplay between the text and the text-bearing artefact” (Driscoll 2010, 95). As texts “do not exist independently of their material embodiments” (2010, 90), these physical objects are studied

⁴³Material philology and related shifts in philological practices at the end of the 1980s has been called by a variety of names over the years, including artefactual philology (Driscoll 2010), the artefactual approach (Hansen 2017), materialist philology (Nichols 1996), and the controversial new philology (Nichols 1990, Williams 2003, 289) proposes the term renewed philology (Sw. förnyad filologi), while Backvall (2013, 48-49) proposes the differentiation of descriptive philology (Sw. deskriptiv filologi) from reconstructive philology (Sw. rekonstruktiv filologi), terms which, to my mind, could be applied to the study of both text and the physical object (one could imagine undertaking a reconstructive study of manuscripts as artefacts, for example). Here I employ the term material philology not only for its general recognition in the field of Old Nordic studies but also (and mostly) for the sake of clarity regarding the focus of study: the material object and its connection to the text.
not only as mere sources of the text, but as the products of “a series of processes [...] at particular times, in particular places and for particular purposes” (Driscoll 2010, 91).

In what is at times referred to as the “birth certificate” of material philology (Hufnagel 2012, 47), Stephen Nichols calls for a philology that returns back “to its roots in a manuscript culture” (Nichols 1990, 1; italics original), emphasizing the importance of the physical manuscripts in the study of medieval texts. He later writes regarding the manuscripts:

in addition to their simply preserving the texts, often in more or less variation, they furnish material context that in recent years has come to be more fully appreciated than ever before. Such features as the ink and script of a given text; the quality [...] all these features yield information, over and above that implied in the texts themselves, about the text’s audience, its purpose, and even the intention an individual scribe may have had in producing this particular copy. (Nichols 1996, 1)

The investigation of these aspects of the manuscript involves the tools of codicology, the study of manuscript books as physical artefacts. Gumbert (2004a) proposes the specifying term material codicology as the study “concerned with the manuscript book as a material object and a craftsman’s product” (2004b, 507), i.e. an artefactual study of the manuscript book. Applied to the individual manuscript, this artefactual approach may involve the study of production materials, script, and layout (mise-en-page) to determine the relative wealth or prestige of the manuscript maker or patron; or an investigation of the collation and texts to differentiate codicological units — distinct groups of quires produced together and containing a single text or group of texts, forming a complete unit (Gumbert 2004d, 40) – in the study of composite manuscripts, for example (e.g. Arvidsson 2016; Backman 2017).

This artefactual approach is also applicable on a larger scale using quantitative codicology – the statistical study of large groups of manuscripts – with the aim of finding patterns regarding production and use of manuscripts containing a certain text (e.g. Hufnagel 2012; Horn 2016) or the custodial history of a collection (e.g. Stegmann 2017).

In her study of Icelandic manuscripts containing Sörla saga sterka, Hufnagel (2012) concludes that “form follows function” (2012, 174), finding for example that scholarly manuscripts (those written by or for scholars, for which the exemplar manuscript is often known; 2012, 100) differ significantly from their non-scholarly counterparts: margins are wider, the text density lower, and abbreviations fewer. Applying quantitative codicology to the non-scholarly group, Hufnagel concludes

---

44 Also known as production units (Du. productie-eenheid); cf. Kwakkel (2002, 13-14).
the manuscripts can “be divided into prestigious and stately objects with decoration on the one hand, and, on the other, plain and simple manuscripts for reading” (2012, 196).

Drawing on the methods used by Hufnagel, Ladefoged (2016) performed her own quantitative codicological study of 92 Danish law manuscripts from the period 1250-1500, distinguishing four types of manuscripts based on form and their intended use. The corpus of Guta lag manuscripts is too small for quantitative codicology, though two of the resulting categories described by Ladefoged (2016) can be applied to the Gutnish material: traditional (Da. traditionel) manuscripts, which tend to be parchment quartos written in a single column, with rubrics, one- or two-colored initials, and minimal decoration; and a user-friendly group (Da. brugsgruppe) of manuscripts, which tend to be smaller in format and place more focus on structural aids than on decoration.

Material philology grew out of a shift in focus during the final decades of the twentieth century, which rejected the “orthodoxy [that] manuscripts were imperfect vehicles full of scribal corruptions” and therefore a “form of illegitimacy” (Nichols 1988, 2). Drawing heavily on the axiom that “l’écriture médiévale ne produit pas des variantes, elle est variance” (Cerquiglini 1989, 111) [medieval writing does not produce variants; it is variance], this approach to the medieval text aims not to erase the changes which occurred between the original text (if there ever was one) and the attested sources, but to embrace them, a clear critique of traditional textual criticism.

Textual criticism

A text can be conceptualized on three distinct levels, as laid out by Wendt (2006). At the highest level of abstraction is the work (Sw. textverk or simply verk), which encompasses all known and unknown iterations of a text – from its reconstructed authorial original to the modern-day film adaptation. Each iteration of a text can be termed the witness (Sw. vittne; also called the text, e.g. Driscoll 2010, 94), with any group of witnesses sharing features that distinguish them from other witnesses forming a witness type (Sw. vittnestyp). At the most concrete level we find the text-bearer (Sw. textbärare) or artefact (Driscoll 2010), the physical object that contains the witness, be it a handwritten manuscript, a printed book, a newspaper, or even a film reel.

Textual criticism, inasmuch as it aims to uncover “a text as close as possible to the original” (Maas 1958, 1) or “den tekstversjonen som dei andre handskriftene kan først tilbake til” (Haugen 2013, 84) [the version of the text to which the other manuscripts can be traced back], depends on the body of witnesses in order to reconstruct backward in time, much as comparative linguistics relies on syn-

45Translation by Betsy Wing (Cerquiglini 1999, 77-89).
chronic descriptions of language stages to work toward the reconstruction of a proto-language. The approach known as *Lachmann’s method* — named after the German scholar Karl Lachmann (1793-1851), who applied the method to his studies of the lost manuscript of Lucretius ([Lachmann 1850/2010](#); see also [Goold 1958](#)), although the method had already been in practice before (see e.g. [Timpanaro 2005](#)) — involves building a *stemma codicum*, or family tree of extant manuscripts, based on the variants they contain; manuscripts containing a common error are thought to derive from a single *hypearchetype*, a now-lost manuscript which first contained this error, while the entirety of the manuscript corpus derives from a single *archetype*, a lost manuscript “free from all errors arising after the split and [...] therefore closer to the original than the text of any of the witnesses” ([Maas 1958](#), 2).

Whether this original text ever existed or not is of course always a potential matter of debate. The text as it has been handed down in manuscripts is likely to be known from multiple witnesses (discussed above) which vary from one another to greater or lesser degrees to the point of representing different versions or redactions. Following a discussion of recent scholars’ definitions and understandings, [Hufnagel (2012)](#) concludes with defining *version* as:

> a partial recomposition or restructuring of a work with considerable alterations leading to a change in the overall aesthetic effect of the whole work. [...] Where the differences affect only short, isolated textual instances without a change in aesthetic effect, it is not a version but a variant. ([Hufnagel 2012](#), 75)

Whereas the version is the aesthetic of the text, we may define the *recension* as the product of editorial change, which is inherited in subsequent manuscripts, thus being the textual equivalent of a manuscript family or branch on the stemma codicum. The stage of textual criticism known as *recensio* ([Maas 1958](#)) thus involves the identification of recensions in a manuscript tradition.

An early critique of Lachmann came from the French scholar Joseph Bédier (1836-1938), who disagreed with the approach on the principle that it almost inevitably produced bifurcating trees ([Bédier 1928](#), 171). Only a few years prior, however, the English bibliographer W. W. Greg (1875-1959) argued for exactly those variants which divide a manuscript corpus into two groups, each containing at least two manuscripts, to be of utmost significance for establishing a family tree:

> If we have a variant AB:CD, then one or other reading must differ from that of the archetype, and one or another group must be genetic: there can be no question of all four manuscripts being independently derived. Different forms of type-2 variants will divide up our collection in different ways, and these divisions will correspond to the ramifications of the family tree. ([Greg 1927](#), 22)
While we might disagree on the point that, given a variant AB:CD, either AB or CD is inherited (as both could potentially differ from the archetype), Greg (1927) is correct in noting that only those variants which divide the manuscripts into groups of two or more members are significant in determining the stemmatic relationship. And, given a collateral group (all extant manuscripts which are not direct descendants of other extant manuscripts) of four manuscripts, it is only these type-2 variants that produce such groups. A variant ABC:D says nothing about the grouping of the manuscripts, as D most likely differs from the archetype, while ABC have merely preserved the original reading. Likewise, a variant AB:C:D does not inherently prove AB form a group, but rather that C and D have diverged from the original. This is even the case if the reading in AB can be proven to be an emendation, as it cannot be determined that this development in AB never occurred in C or D as well. Should a reading be missing in any of the four manuscripts, we are left with what Greg (1927) terms the ambiguity of three texts, where “it is impossible either to prove or to disprove independent derivation” (Greg 1927, 21).

Exactly which variants can be used in creating a stemma (and, moreover, which should be included in the critical apparatus) remains a point of debate within textual criticism. As Heiles (2014, 184) points out, the history of the field is “a history of selection criteria”. It is crucial to bear in mind the inherent subjectivity in the selection of variants (cf. Maas 1958, 10), a phenomenon we may term the Editor’s paradox, to borrow from sociolinguistics (the Observer’s paradox; Labov 2006, 86). A first step to selecting significant variants, then, is understanding what types of variation may occur in the manuscript tradition.

Winters (1991) proposes a tripartite division of manuscript variation, consisting of slips, errors, and true variants. Common to all manuscripts, slips are the “inaccuracies arising from the necessary movement of the scribe’s eye from source manuscript to the page on which he was writing” (Winters 1991, 133), or what Frellesvig (1996, 107) considers “incidental errors in performance” (italics original). Various categories of slips are well known within the field of manuscript studies, such as dittography and haplography, confusion of minims or other similar-looking graphemes, or saut du même au même. Whereas these are one-time inaccuracies arising between exemplar and copy, errors “arise from true ignorance” (Winters 1991, 133) of the linguistic form and are “systematic mistakes in competence” (Frellesvig 1996, 107; italics original). Finally, true variants arise through the autonomy of the scribe, who “may act as editor, improving, or at least to his own satisfaction, the text put before him to copy” (Winters 1991, 134).

In order for significant variants “to be discerned amid the crowds of unimportant ones” (West 1973, 86), it should prove beneficial to establish a typology of vari-
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46 This concept is similar to the groupings of languages, where common retention cannot be used in determining language groupings; cf. Campbell (2004, 190ff.).
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ants in the sense given by Winters (1991), from the minute variation of letterforms to the greatest, significant changes in text. Here I wish to propose three distinct, though occasionally overlapping categories of variants, each of these categories – graphic, linguistic, and textual – in turn containing types of variants worthy of consideration.

1. On the graphic level of variation, I find two types: graphemic and orthographic. By graphemic variation I mean variation within the use of letterforms or graphemes, such as ⟨ß⟩ versus ⟨ſſ⟩ or, known from printed culture, ⟨aa⟩ versus ⟨å⟩. Studies of graphemic variation are often found within the domain of paleography, and are of course useful for e.g. the identification of individual scribes, such as the scribe of Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 187 8vo, whose hand has been identified in a diploma, Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, Dipl. Dan. LX, 22r based on individual letterforms, despite the two manuscripts being written using two different scripts (Kro- man 1943, 68). Orthographic variation refers then to which graphemes are used to represent various sounds, for example ⟨þ⟩ versus ⟨th⟩ for [θ], or ⟨z⟩ versus ⟨s⟩ after dentals. Further included in orthographic variation is the use of abbreviations such as nasal strokes, ⟨ꝫ⟩ for et, or ⟨ꝝ⟩ for rum.

Graphic and linguistic variation overlap in the form of phonetic variation; that is, the use of graphemes to represent varying sounds (as opposed to variant graphemes representing a single sound, i.e. orthographic variation). An example from Old Icelandic is the use of ⟨eing⟩ for older ⟨eng⟩, indicating the diphthongization of short e before ng which occurred in the early fourteenth century (cf. Noreen 1923, 110; Stefán Karlsson 2004, 14).

2. On the linguistic level are three types of variation: morphological, lexical, and syntactic. Morphological variation gives indications of the change (or variation) of morphology within the language system, such as the use of the ACC PL ending -a for older -u in MASC u-stems in Icelandic. Lexical variation refers to the use of a completely different lexeme (often synonymous, though not necessarily), in a manuscript recension. An example of lexical variation is the use of eyjar ‘islands’ in Færeyinga saga in the manuscript Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 54 fol., where other manuscripts (e.g. Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 61 fol.) have Færeyjar ‘Faroe Islands’. Finally, syntactic variation can be viewed as two (or more) ways of expressing the same utterance. This type of variation includes syntactic features such as word order or, in a case language, the use of case versus periphrasis.

47 See the edition in Ólafur Halldorsson (1987), where AM 54 fol. and AM 61 fol. are given the sigla C and A, respectively.
example of syntactic variation in English would be the difference between “I gave him the book” and “I gave the book to him”.

3. On the textual level are two types of variation: phrasal and episodic. Phrasal variation might be considered closely related to syntactic variation, but on the textual level; that is, two (or more) ways of expressing the same concept. This type of variation frequently appears in the rubrics of law texts; in *Jyske lov* Book I, Chapter 26, for example, the rubric reads “Of man døør mæth mykæl giald” [If a man dies with much money (indebted)] in the manuscript Copenhagen, Royal Library, NKS 295 8vo, and “tethæ er vm man døør ther miget giald er skildig” [This is if a man dies who owes much money] in Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 5 4to (cf. Skautrup 1933, 67). Episodic variation is the type of variation which most concerns textual critics, constituting variation in the actual content of a text. Such variation can be as minor as a single statute missing or added in a law text, or as major as an entire chapter or ending missing from a saga text. Perhaps the most well-known form of episodic variation is the much-debated final chapter in the Gospel of Mark (cf. Parker 2012, 102).

Only once such a typology of variation has been established will the scholar be well suited to determine which variants in the manuscript corpus are useful in the establishment of the family tree. It is perhaps obvious that the higher levels of variation – textual variation – are the most useful in establishing relationships between manuscripts, though the scholar must also bear in mind the nature of the text being studied. A religious text such as the Bible is less likely to be altered in later manuscript copies, as the text is considered established and unchangeable. An Icelandic saga, on the other hand, may change with every re-telling, and a single scribe may change the text at various times. A third type of text is the medieval legal code, which was binding and official, though subject to change through the years: laws would have been added and deleted, which could have occurred in various recensions individually (polygenesis).

Finally, a word about translation. Not all collateral groups are monolingual; many works, including *Guta lag*, are found in translations in various languages, for which the direct ancestor in the original language is now lost. Which variants, then, are useful in establishing these translated manuscripts’ place in the stemma? In her discussion of the Gothic Bible and the manuscript group to which it belongs, Falluomini (2015) discusses the concept of a significant reading as it applies to translations:

A ‘significant reading’ is a Gothic reading that reflects clearly a single Greek reading. All readings which make no lexical or syntactical sense or are likely due to scribal errors, glosses inserted into the text or clear harmonisation inside the Gothic tradition are not considered, nor is the word order in regard
1.5. THE PRESENT STUDY

to the position of personal, possessive or demonstrative pronouns [...]. (Fal-
quomini 2015, 134 fn. 610)

To reflect a single reading in the original Greek here requires variation among the Greek manuscripts; that is, a Gothic reading cannot point to a single reading if only one Greek reading is known anyway. For the Gothic New Testament, this poses no (or little) problem, due to the sheer size and variation within the Greek New Testament manuscript corpus. The smaller the corpus, the more likely a reading in a translated manuscript derives from a variant not otherwise attested in the original language.

Historical linguistics

Historical linguistics works from the premise that “[l]anguages are not stable, they are constantly changing” (Fox 1995, 1) and, as with the study of historical texts discussed in the previous section, approaches the study of historical languages both synchronically (descriptive) and diachronically (reconstructive). The methods of historical linguistics were developed during the late nineteenth century, especially in the German city of Leipzig, under a group of scholars of Indo-European languages who came to be known as the Neogrammarians (Gm. Junggrammatiker). It was the breakthrough discovery by the Neogrammarians that sound change follows exceptionless laws that brought the field of historical linguistics into a more scientific and systematic method than previous language historians. First written about by August Leskien (1840-1916) in 1876 (cf. Jankowsky 2006, 584), the Ausnahmslogik der Lautgesetze [Regularity of Sound Laws] or Regularity Principle was reformulated two years later by Hermann Osthoff and Karl Brugmann:

Aller lautwandel, so weit er mechanisch vor sich geht, vollzicht sich nach aus-
nahmslosen gesetzen[.] (Osthoff and Brugmann 1878, xiii)

[Every sound change, inasmuch as it occurs mechanically, takes place according to laws that admit no exception. (Murray 2015, 22)]

The Regularity Principle came to be applied in the fundamental method of historical (reconstructive) linguistics, the Comparative Method, which involves the “comparison of functionally similar morphemes in related languages or dialects” (Olander 2015, 13). The comparative method can thus be applied to unbound morphemes (lexemes) such as the Germanic cognates En. father, OIcel. faðir, OHG fatar, Goth. fadar to reconstruct a Proto-Germanic lexeme *fader (and further to PIE *ph₂tḗr; Lat. patēr, Gk. πατήρ, Skt. pitar-), but also bound morphemes, such as OIcel. -r, Runic -ar, Goth. -s (all nom sg ending of masc nouns) < PGmc. *-az (further to PIE *-oς; Lat. -us, Gk. -ος, Skt. -ah).
The Comparative Method is supplemented by the internal study of a single (attested or reconstructed) language or language stage, known as Internal Reconstruction. Disregarding evidence from other Germanic languages, for example, Internal Reconstruction can be applied to demonstrate the lowering of [i] and [u] to [ɛ] and [ↄ] before rhv in Gothic, as seen in e.g. Class III strong verbs such as bindan ‘to bind’, ptc bundans next to bairan [ɛ] ‘to bear’, ptc bairans [ↄ] (cf. Krause 1968, 84-87).

In addition to sound change, languages are frequently subject to analogy, which can be defined as “change modeled on the example of other words or forms” (Beekes and de Vaan 2011, 75) and includes leveling, the process which “reduces the number of allomorphs a form has” (Campbell 2004, 106). The contrast of regular sound change on one hand with analogy and leveling on the other can be summed up in what has become known as Sturtevant’s Paradox (see also Campbell 2004, 109):

Phonetic laws are regular but produce irregularities.
Analogic creation is irregular but produces regularity. (Sturtevant 1947, 109)

The Neogrammarians developed their methods via the study of well-attested languages such as Latin, Greek, and Sanskrit, as well as the historical Germanic languages (Gothic, Old Icelandic, Old High German, Old English) and others. The comparative method and internal reconstruction can nevertheless be applied to languages attested in fewer texts, found only in inscriptions, or sparsely attested. Work is even being done to reconstruct pieces of languages for which the only evidence is loanwords in languages which are attested (substrate linguistic reconstruction; cf. Aikio 2004).

However well attested, there are key differences between living (spoken) languages and historical or text languages, languages found only in written texts or inscriptions. While for the study of living languages it is possible to observe and interrogate native speakers, for text languages the only ‘native speakers’ are the texts themselves. “The data corpus of a text language is finite” notes Fleischman (2000, 34); “new data only become available when previously unknown documents are discovered, whether in the form of manuscripts, printed texts, tablets, etc.” Skafte-Jensen (2011, 73) refers to this finite amount of source material as quantity (Da. kvantum), which she includes among the considerations “der kan have større eller mindre indflydelse på de konklusioner man kan tillade sig at drage” [which can have great or lesser influence over the conclusions one can allow to be drawn] regarding a given linguistic feature or phenomenon. Similarly, the linguist must consider the genre of texts available, as “visse sproglige fenomener forekommer hyppigere i nogle genrer end i andre” (Skafte-Jensen 2011, 73) [certain linguistic phenomena occur more frequently in some genres than in others].

In the same vein is the consideration of chronolect; that is, the synchronic system of language as it differs from previous and later stages of the language. Any text
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potentially contains multiple chronological layers of the language (Skafte-Jensen 2011, 78), and any linguistic change has the potential of appearing in a copy of a text once that change had occurred in the language, though does not necessarily appear. By contrast, any change which had not yet occurred cannot appear in the manuscript. Thus the appearance of linguistic changes in a manuscript can only give a terminus ante quem, i.e. the time before which a change had occurred, and not the terminus post quem, the time after which the change occurred.

Finally, Skafte-Jensen (2011, 73) finds a crucial distinction between spoken and written language: in writing, the process of formulating one’s thought into language is separate from the formulated (written) product, whereas in speech, these are simultaneous phenomena. Skafte-Jensen (2011, 37) terms this consideration register, which within linguistics is usually defined as “any language variety defined by its situational characteristics, including the speaker’s purpose, the relationship between the speaker and hearer, and the production circumstances” (Biber 2006, 476). Such a definition is equally applicable to historical (text) languages, for which one should distinguish between autograph, copy, and translation (and copy of a translation), if not more.

When dealing with text languages, the linguist must also take into consideration the basic, though often ignored, premise laid out by Frellesvig (1996): “writing is a representation of spoken language” (1996, 99), though “not necessarily [...] a complete representation of the spoken language” (1996, 106; italics original). Writing, Frellesvig claims, is a form of transmutation, or the “interpretation of verbal signs by means of signs of nonverbal sign systems” (Jakobson 1959, 233).

The medieval scribe writing in the vernacular would have been guided by orthographic norms, the “socially sanctioned spellings” (Frellesvig 1996, 107) which deviate from the general attempts of representing the spoken language in a phonographic script. Frellesvig (1996, 108) argues these orthographic norms to be “linked to specific words or morphemes”, for example the silent b in En. debt, introduced to show a connection with Lat. dēbitum, or the use of ij, typically pronounced [ei], in the Dutch suffix -lijk ‘-ly’, pronounced [lәk]. This restriction of orthographic norms ought to be expanded, however; the Old Danish practice of doubling tall graphs such as ⟨ſ⟩, ⟨ſ⟩, and ⟨ſ⟩ in word-initial position (cf. Skautrup 1944, II, 45) is an example of an orthographic norm.

In addition to the “socially sanctioned” orthographic norms are the scribes’ individual norms. Kjeldsen (2013, 21) differentiates a scribe’s norm, the “idealbillede af skriften han har på et givet tidspunkt” [ideal picture of (orthography and) script he has at a given point in time], from the scribe’s use (Da. brug) or “den faktiske realisering af skriften” [the actual realization of the (orthography and) script].
Language contact

A frequent catalyst for language change is *language contact*. Two languages are said to be in contact “if they are used alternately by the same persons” (Weinreich 1967, 1). These language users are the *locus* of contact, and thus the impetus for contact-induced change.

While it is true that “contact-induced change remains essentially unpredictable” (Thomason 2001, 61), patterns do emerge, depending on the languages in contact, their similarity to each other, and which language is dominant for the speaker(s). In his study of contact between the closely-related languages Faroese (Far.) and Danish (Da.) on the Faroe Islands, Petersen (2010) finds a quantifiable difference between the effects of *Recipient language* (RL) agentivity – that is, the speakers’ native or dominant language (Far.) being affected by their knowledge of another language (Da.) – and *Source language* (SL) agentivity – the speakers’ production of their non-native language (Da.) being affected by their native or dominant language (Far.); see also Table 1.1. The most common form of contact-induced change in RL agentivity is *borrowing* – usually of lexical items following a certain hierarchy, although other items may be borrowed as well. SL agentivity, on the other hand, involves the *imposition* of elements from the dominant language onto the non-dominant language; in Faroe-Danish, Petersen (2010, 79) finds the imposition of Faroese pronunciation, morphology, and syntax, as well as the imposition of Faroese vocabulary in the form of code-switching and nonce borrowings.

*Code-switching* is distinguished from *nonce borrowings* in SL agentivity by the feature [±nativized] (cf. Thomason 2001, 134; Petersen 2010, 200). A true code-switch involves a complete shift from one language to another, including the pronunciation and inflection, and is perceived by the speaker and listener as belonging to a different linguistic system, thus [-nativized]. A nonce borrowing, on the other hand, is adapted to the RL, thus [+nativized], much like a borrowing in RL agentivity receives the feature [+native] (see also Petersen 2010, 75ff.). For the SL agentivity of Faroe-Danish, Petersen (2010, 81) finds two general triggers for code-switching and nonce borrowings:

1. Homophonous diamorphs: Words which are similar in the two languages

### Table 1.1: Differences between Recipient and Source language agentivity (adapted from Petersen 2010, 72).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>RL agentivity</th>
<th>SL agentivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lexicon</td>
<td>Much</td>
<td>Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phonology</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Much</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morphology</td>
<td>Little</td>
<td>Little to moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syntax</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pragmatic</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


may “serve as bridges or triggers for the code-mix” (Muysken 2000, 123), such as when a Faroe-Danish speaker pronounces Da. *afstand* [aw-] ‘distance’ as Far. *avstand* [æ-].

2. Pragmatic force: A Faroe-Danish speaker may insert a Faroese lexical item into a Danish setting out of need or gap-filling, such as Far. *tjaldrid* ‘oystercatcher’, the Faroese national bird, rather than Da. *strandskade*.

Both borrowing and imposition are forms of interference, defined as “[t]hose instances of deviation from the norms of either language which occur in the speech of bilinguals as a result of their familiarity with more than one language” (Weinreich 1967, 1).

Language contact does not only occur in spoken language but may be present in written language as well, for which Johanson (2013) proposes the term written language intertwining. For Johanson, the crucial factor at play for different types of intertwining is not the dominance of one language over another, but rather the relative prestige of the intertwining languages. He divides written language intertwining into five types based on relative prestige (Johanson 2013, 274):

- Type A involves elements from the higher prestige language being borrowed into the lower prestige language, for example the use of Latin elements within vernacular manuscripts.
- Type B involves elements from the lower prestige language being transferred into the higher prestige language, which Johanson notes “may be the result of imperfect learning” (2013, 278) and may thus be equated with SL agentivity.
- Type C involves true alternation or code-switching, such as macaronic verses.
- Type D involves the use of the lower prestige language to explicate texts in the higher prestige language, such as vernacular glosses in Latin manuscripts.
- Type E involves elements from the higher prestige language used to represent elements from the lower prestige language, such as the use of Latin *i.e.* (*id est*) to represent ‘that is’ in English.

These types all assume a mixture of two rather distinct codes or languages, although vernacular manuscripts often involve a more subtle mixture of dialects or stages of a single language, resulting in supposed monolingual texts as products of language contact. Frellesvig (1996, 107) notes that, considering extant manuscripts are most often copies of other manuscripts, they likely contain both corruption – in the sense of slips and errors, discussed above – as well as correction. Both are deviations from the original manuscript which, at times, “may be a representation of the spoken language of the copyist where this is different from the spoken language of the writer” (1996, 107). The copyist may have spoken “another sociolect, dialect, chronolect, or
simply a different language” (1996, 108) than the writer or the copyist of the exemplar manuscript. This, in addition to orthographic norms and other features of writing discussed above, results in a manuscript which may contain any number of linguistic layers and deviations from the final scribe’s norm, inherited from earlier manuscripts within the recension.

The process of copying a manuscript and the types of deviation which may occur as the result of a language contact situation may be summed up in the example of two manuscripts of Jyske lov, Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 4 4to and AM 11 4to. The latter, an early-sixteenth-century parchment manuscript, is a direct copy of the former, which dates from the late twelfth or early thirteenth century. Skautrup (1933) writes regarding the manuscripts:

>Afskriften følger ret slavisk forlægget, og er så omtrent ordret. Frihederne er dels ortografiske [...], dels lydlige moderniseringer [...], dels “retskrivnings”-bestemte former [...], dels enkelte novationer [...]. Sjælden drister [kopiet] sig til lexikografiske fornyelser [...], og syntaktiske afvigelser fra [forlægget] findes vist ikke. (Skautrup 1933, lxi)

[The copy slavishly follows the exemplar and is similarly arranged. Liber-ties taken are partly orthographic, partly phonological modernizations, partly forms defined by a “standard orthography”, partly individual innovations. The copy rarely ventures towards lexical updates, and syntactic deviation from the exemplar is not found.]

In addition to these modernizations and updates in AM 11 4to are mistakes inherited from the exemplar AM 4 4to, corrections of mistakes, and new mistakes due to the misreading of the exemplar manuscript. Such an understanding of the copying process can be applied to the study of a manuscript whose exemplar has been lost, such as Codex B.

1.5.2 Methods

The primary source of data for the present study has been the corpus of Guta lag manuscripts. I have personally visited the manuscript collections at the Swedish Royal Library in Stockholm, the Danish Royal Library in Copenhagen, and the Arnamagnæan Collection in Copenhagen, where my Ph.D. project was based. A full codicological investigation was performed on all seven manuscripts, including measurements, scribal hands, and – with the help of Natasha Fazlic and Mustafa Kamal at the conservation studio in the Arnamagnæan Collection – collation and watermarks. The codicological descriptions of the two codices held at the Arnamagnæan Collection (AM 54 4to and AM 55 4to) have been made available in the online catalogue [Handrit.is (2009-2017)]. Full digital photographs of the manuscripts taken
by Suzanne Reitz are also available on the website. Photographs of the Stockholm manuscripts B 64 and B 65 are already available via the Royal Library’s online catalogue Regina (n.d.).

To investigate the text I have transcribed the entirety of Codex B with XML-markup following the guidelines set by the Text Encoding Initiative (TEI 2017). Every individual word was placed within a word-tag <w> with a unique identification (@xml:id) and lemmatized (@lemma).

Variants from Codices A, G, and D were then added to the XML document using the series of critical apparatus tags <app>, <lem>, and <rdg> (TEI 2017, 12 ‘Critical Apparatus’). In this way, a complete diplomatic edition of Codex B with a critical apparatus could be produced using LATEX, here given in Appendix D.

The copy of the later Danish ordinances found at the end of G, which was used as a comparative sample of David Bilefeld’s orthography in Danish, was likewise fully transcribed and lemmatized in XML-markup, here given in Appendix E.

1.5.3 Outline of the present study

The following five chapters can essentially be divided into two parts: one philological, one linguistic. The philological component begins with Chapter 2, which presents the codicological descriptions of all the manuscripts of Guta lag. Using the theories established in the field of material philology, especially the concept that “form follows function” (Hufnagel 2012, 174), the chapter concludes with a discussion on what the physical aspects of Codex B reveal regarding the production, intention, and use of the manuscript.

Chapter 3 presents the textual scholarship aspects of the present study, including an investigation into the contents of Codex B and a discussion of the relative age of various sections of Guta lag. The position of the β recension within the context of the remaining three is then discussed, centered on the question of a stemma of Guta lag manuscripts, such as the one proposed by Peel (2006, 2009, 2015). The marginal notes in Codex B and their possible origin are then treated, followed by a discussion of whether Codex B truly presents an older redaction of Guta lag as previously proposed.

The linguistic component of the present study comprises Chapters 4-6. Chapter 4 discusses the orthography and phonology of Codex B, and the interplay between these two. Investigations of the general orthographic tendencies of the manuscript are given first, divided into consonants and vowels. Following these, more specific sources of orthographic and phonological variation are discussed. The chapter concludes with a discussion of what the orthography reveals regarding the scribal
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43 I would like to thank Gottskálk Jensen for arranging for the uploading the images to the Hand-rit website.
practices of David Bilefeld, developments within Old Gutnish phonology, and the possible origin of the scribe of the exemplar manuscript.

Chapter 5 discusses morphological variation as found in the younger codex, beginning with individual paradigms which show later developments due to various processes of leveling, reduction, and phonetic changes. More general aspects of the nominal morphology, which shows more drastic developments than are found in the verbal system, are discussed thereafter. The chapter concludes with a discussion of Codex B as a witness to later stages within the development of the Gutnish morphological system.

The final chapter within the linguistic section, Chapter 6, discusses the unique lexicon found only in Codex B. The chapter begins with a discussion of lexemes found in provisions and chapters which are missing from the elder codex, and moves on to discuss lexemes found as variant readings and are thus otherwise missing from Codex A. Following this is a discussion of a few lexemes for which Codex B clarifies an otherwise difficult reading in the elder codex, while the chapter concludes with a discussion of how Codex B expands our understanding of the vocabulary of Old Gutnish.

The concluding chapter, Chapter 7, summarizes the discussions given in chapters 2-6 and focuses on the question of what, if anything, can be said about the exemplar manuscript.
Chapter 2

Codicology

2.1 Codex B and the \( \beta \) recension

\begin{itemize}
  \item AM 54 49
  \item GKS 3363 4to 54
  \item Kall 650 4to 57
\end{itemize}

2.2 Other manuscripts of Guta lag

\begin{itemize}
  \item B 64 58
  \item B 65 62
  \item AM 55 4to 66
  \item B 68 71
\end{itemize}

2.3 David Bilefeld and the manuscript corpus

2.4 Discussion

The present chapter contains codicological and paleographical descriptions of the seven manuscripts containing Guta lag, which are further listed in the appendix on pg. \[281\]. Each manuscript is discussed individually following the same catalogue entry format. A manuscript is first introduced with key information to orient the reader. This is followed by a description of the physical properties of the manuscript, given under the umbrella heading ‘Structure and Support’. The features discussed are:

**Materials** including number of written and unwritten leaves, support, measurements of the book block (height \( \times \) width in mm), and evidence for cutting. Descriptions of watermarks are also given.

**Collation** following the system used by Ker (1957, xxii), which has been chosen for its brevity and clear presentation of relevant information. This collation formula consists of a roman numeral for the quire number (lowercase for endleaves or otherwise unwritten quires) followed by a superscript arabic numeral for the original number of leaves; e.g. “I\( ^8 \)” indicates the first written quire was an original quaternion. Changes to the quire, such as added or removed leaves, are given in parentheses; e.g. “(+ 1 after 5)” indicates a leaf
has been added after the fifth leaf in the quire, while “(wants 2)” indicates the original second leaf is now missing. Finally, half-sheets (singletons) are given in a parenthetical note; e.g. “(3 and 6 are half-sheets)” indicates three bifolia consisting of the conjoined leaves 1-8, 2-7, and 4-5 can be discerned, while the third and sixth leaves do not form a conjoined pair (bifolium).

**Foliation** and/or pagination of the manuscript, whether by the main scribe or a later hand.

**Layout** of the main text of the manuscript, including measurements of the written area (height × width in mm), number of columns, and average number of lines per page. Visual indications of new chapters and provisions is also discussed.

**Binding** of the manuscript, including measurements (height × width × depth in mm), dating, and present condition.

**Condition** of the manuscript today.

Following the physical description of the manuscript is a description of the script used, including number of hands, as well as decorative features such as enlarged initials, rubrics, etc., all under the heading ‘Script and Decoration’. When defining script types, it should be borne in mind that “[n]omenclature is a thorny issue,” as noted by Brown (1990, 1), “with standardization still far from being realized”. This problem is compounded when dealing with manuscripts in different languages, stemming from different writing milieux. Derolez (2003, 17) speaks of a “strong element of national bias present in palaeographical studies”, which becomes evident when attempting to label the scripts of Nordic and German manuscripts using English terminology. Furthermore, the Gotlandic material covers both the Late Medieval and Post-Reformation periods, for which no single system of terminology exists. As such, the labels used for the various scripts will be general, with reference to relevant terminology and literature in the national languages, leaving room for description of the more characteristic features of each individual hand.

Thereafter follows a discussion of the history of the manuscript under the heading ‘Origin and Provenance’.

The manuscripts belonging to the β recension are discussed first in §2.1, beginning with Codex B. Manuscripts from the remaining three recensions are discussed thereafter in §2.2.

The hand of David Bilefeld, who copied Codex B, has been identified in other manuscripts of the Gotlandic law, which is discussed in §2.3. The chapter concludes with a discussion of the results from this codicological study and its significance for Codex B (§2.4).
2.1 Code B and the $\beta$ recension

Recension $\beta$ of *Guta lag* is known from three paper manuscripts, all housed in Copenhagen. In addition to AM 54 4to, referred to here as ‘Codex B’, are two descendant manuscripts: the late seventeenth- or early eighteenth-century copy GKS 3363 ($B_1$) and its direct copy Kall 650 ($B_2$), from roughly the same period.

2.1.1 AM 54

Codex B is the only manuscript housed at the Arnamagnæan Collection written in the Old Gutnish language. This unassuming post-reformation paper manuscript in quarto contains only the law code *Guta lag*, copied by a Danish priest on Gotland. The language, while clearly Gutnish, is noticeably younger than that of the medieval manuscript of *Guta lag* and *Guta saga*, Codex A ($\S2.2.1$), and shows Danish influence, especially in spelling. The sections included in the law text, on the other
hand, retain an older recension of Guta lag than that found in Codex A.

David Bilefeld, the scribe of Codex B, copied the manuscript in 1587 from an exemplar manuscript written in 1470, now lost. It is not known who the scribe of this exemplar manuscript was, but as will be argued in the present study, the hand responsible was likely also a Dane. It is also clear from Codex B that Bilefeld had access to other manuscripts of Guta lag, including Codex A and the German translation (§ 2.2.2); furthermore, the scribe was well versed in Danish law, as he refers to Jyske lov in marginal notes (§ 3.3.4).

The title page of the manuscript is incomplete, containing only the date 1587 (“Anno Domini MDLXXVII”) and the letters “LEC”, which Pipping (1901, 83) argues had been intended to read Leges Gotlibandorum. Likewise the final written leaf (57v) ends with the date (“Anno 1587. 19. Maij.”) and the initials “D. B. C.” Schlyter (1852, xi) proposes reading this abbreviation as David Bilefelt [sic] Curatus; however, considering the scribe’s origin can be traced back to the Jutlandic peninsula (§ 2.1.1), a better reading may be David Bilefeld Cimmer.

The layout of Codex B indicates a manuscript intended for personal use. Titles are written in a slightly larger script, and new statutes are indicated with pilcrows, often highlighted in red, yet otherwise the manuscript is left undecorated. On the other hand, the prevalence of marginal notes, whether taken from collation with the main exemplar, from other manuscripts of Guta lag, or from Danish law, point to a law book that was used by its creator.

**Structure and Support**

**Materials** Codex B consists of 58 written and four blank paper leaves arranged into eight quires. The book block has been cut to measure 207 × 163; the lower fore-edge of fol. 40 contains a corner folded inward that has avoided this cutting.

The same watermark is found throughout the main manuscript: two castle towers with battlements and windows on a base. Between the towers is an archway and gable, and in the base the initial ‘M’ is found; see Figure 2.2.8

A second watermark is found on the flyleaf, contemporary with the binding, consisting of a crowned coat of arms of Amsterdam flanked by lions rampant; underneath the initial ‘W’ is half visible, having been cut off.

**Collation** I⁶ (+1 after 5), II-V⁸, VI⁸ (+1 after 3), VII⁸, VIII⁶

**Foliation** The main scribe has foliated the recto side of each folio in the main text of the manuscript, numbered 1-55. A later hand has added 56-57 on the last

---

1 A similar watermark, dated to the final decade of the sixteenth century, is found in the legal manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, B 173; see Åström (2013, 72-73, 141).
two rectos, which contain the table of contents. This same later hand has also added 1 on the title page, changing the original 1r to 1\textsuperscript{bis}r.

Each of the quires, with the exception of the first, are further labeled with quire signatures, a capital letter centered at the bottom of the page in sequential order from B to H.\textsuperscript{3}

**Layout** The entire manuscript is written in a single column, with between 19 and 22 unruled lines per page. The written area measures 135 × 115.

Individual chapters are numbered with arabic numerals and begin on a new line, with another line break between the rubric and the beginning of the chapter itself. Two in-line rubrics are found on 34r (Chapter 36) and 43v (Chapter 50). Furthermore, the form ⟨Tha⟩ 45v9 ‘when’ is written in red at the beginning of a new provision in Chapter 54. Otherwise new provisions are indicated with a pilcrow (paragraph mark) in red.

A table of contents on 55v-57v lists the chapter titles in alternating colors (red and brown). For each title, both a chapter and page number is given.

**Binding** The manuscript is bound in a stiff vellum binding, which Árni Magnússon had likely ordered in the first decades of the eighteenth century.\textsuperscript{3} The binding, which measures 205 × 170 × 15 at the spine, is in good condition, and the manuscript easily lays flat when open. When closed, the binding measures 20 mm deep at the fore-edge.

**Condition** The manuscript is in good condition, with no major damage or defect. Small holes can be found in some of the leaves, measuring 2-4 mm, e.g. fols. 23, 37, 38. Some pages have been reinforced near the spine, e.g. 13, 14, 46.

**Script and Decoration**

The main text of Codex B is written in dark ink with rubrics, initials, and pilcrows occasionally highlighted in red. The entirety of the text, including marginalia, is written in a single hand using a Neogothic script (Da. *nygotisk*; \textit{Kroman} 1970). While the ductus of this current script is quick, short letters such as ⟨a c e o⟩ are nevertheless executed with two strokes. A variant form of ⟨e⟩ resembles Greek

\textsuperscript{2}Pipping (1901, 82) appears to misunderstand the use of these quire signatures, noting the scribe’s intention of marking every eight leaf. After listing the folio numbers for signatures B-F, Pipping observes that “s]edan förvirras räkningen” [then the counting is confused] between F and G, and that H is misplaced. However, the signatures are clearly on the first recto of every quire (except the first), the discrepancy from F to G is due to the half-sheet found in quire VI (see collation).

\textsuperscript{3}Árni Magnússon employed two different bookbinders, Hans Gylling and Berthel Wolcken, from around 1710 until his death in 1730; many of the bindings are described in various invoices as being ‘vellum’ or ‘old vellum’ (\textit{Springborg} 1995, 43).
epsilon \( \epsilon \). Ascenders generally slant rightwards, with the exception of \( \delta \) which extends to the left. Spurs occur on \( \psi \) and \( \upsilon \), as well as on the stem of tall \( \iota \) and occasionally on ascenders of \( b \, h \), etc. Capital \( T \) has a rounded variant \( \Upsilon \), while capital \( H \) has a variant \( \check{h} \) with no second ascender. Lowercase \( h \) is perhaps one of the most characteristic letters of the scribe; it consists of a broken ascender, which resembles lowercase \( l \) (that is, a right-leaning ascender which breaks to the right near the baseline) followed by a limb which curves below the baseline (see §2.3).

Diacritics are found on \( \bar{u} \), whose bow helps distinguish it from \( n \). A dieresis above \( \breve{i} \) often makes the letter indistinguishable from double \( ij \). Lowercase \( i \) is always dotted, although when the dot is executed quickly and close to the minim, the letter can easily be confused with \( e \). Likewise \( o \), executed in two strokes, occasionally resembles \( e \).

Missing from the script in AM 54 4to is word-final cursive or bowed \( s \); otherwise both tall \( s \) and short \( s \) are found, the latter in all positions. Tall \( s \) is limited to initial and medial position, with the only example of word-final \( s \) being \( ruff \) 7r20 ‘horse’. The letter is further found in the ligatures \( \beta \, \theta \, \delta \), while the ligature \( \check{c} \) is also found.

Decoration is minimal, consisting of two- to four-line flourished initials, often highlighted with red, at the beginning of new chapters. Abbreviations are likewise minimal, though frequent terms for monetary value are commonly abbreviated, e.g. \( M \) for \textit{mark ‘mark (coin)’}, \( S. \) for \textit{silfr ‘silver’}, and \( pe{
fty}\) for \textit{penning ‘coin’}. Numbers are commonly minuscule roman numerals, especially in reference to monetary amounts. A nasal stroke, though not common, occurs for word-final nasals, geminates, and before \( g \), while a similar bar appears as the abbreviation for ‘re’ in roughly half of the occurrences of the word \textit{prestr ‘priest’}. One occurrence of a
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flourish extending through the descender of ⟨p⟩, an abbreviation for ‘pro’, is found on 9v2; however, this abbreviation mark was added to an original ⟨p⟩, an abbreviation for ‘pre’, as the scribe emended an original reading ⟨prestir⟩ ‘priest’ to ⟨proastir⟩ ‘provost’. The Latin siglum ⟨ꝫ⟩ is used to represent ‘et’, though only in the words ĺet ‘it’ and ĺetta ‘this’, 4 never in miþ, meþ ‘with’ as is common in e.g. Old Swedish manuscripts (cf. Jansson 1943, 127). By far the most common abbreviation, however, is the er-tittle ⟨◌̉⟩, frequently placed above final -r to indicate the svarabhakti vowel (§4.2.5), though also found as an abbreviation for ‘er’ in ⟨gerningom⟩ 1bis r11 ‘deeds’.

Origin and Provenance

Codex B is a treasure trove for the philologist as it explicitly mentions both the scribe and the date of completion, and provides clues towards the scribe’s exemplar manuscript. A colophon on 55r supplies this information:

Figure 2.3: Colophon on B 55r. Image: Suzanne Reitz.


[Written ad XIV Kal. Jun. [May 19] 1587 by David Bilefeld, Priest at Barlingbo and Provost of the Northern Riding, according to the exemplar written ad 1470.]

David Hansen Bilefeld, 5 (†1596) was a priest from Jutland who came to Gotland in 1569 after receiving his magister degree from the University of Rostock the previous year. 6 Having originally come to Gotland to tutor the sons of the Danish sheriff

4Bilefeld typically spells the demonstrative pronoun with ⟨i⟩, i.e. ⟨thitta⟩. However ⟨e⟩ occurs in two tokens:ACC SG NEUT (Thetta) 3r4 and DAT SG NEUT (thesso) 53v13 (§4.2.4).

5The patronym is often rendered Hansson, but is here given according to Modern Danish practice.

6According to the matriculation registry from the university, Bilefeld enrolled in September 1566 and listed his place of origin as “Cimber” (http://purl.uni-rostock.de/matrikel/100028153, accessed 07-12-2016).
(Da. lensmand) of the island, Jens Bille (1531-1575), Bilefeld eventually became the schoolmaster in Visby (1571), priest of Barlingbo and Ekeby, as well as provost of the Northern Riding (1582), and finally superintendent of the Danish church on Gotland (1592), being the third superintendent (bishop) since the founding of the bishopric in Visby.

How Bilefeld’s manuscript came to mainland Denmark is not known (Bilefeld died in Visby), but according to the slip written by Árni Magnússon in the front of the manuscript, it belonged to the collector Jens Rosenkrantz (1640-1695). The slip reads:

Hæc ex LL Gotlandicis provincialibus penes Janum Rosæncranzium, habentibus capita 82, descriptis 1587 ex vetusto exemplari scripto 1470, quod ex pura lingvâ ferè Norvegicâ depravatum esse clare patet, Titulus horam legum est Guthalag. (ÁM slip)

[This from the book of Gotlandic provincial laws [belonging to] Jens Rosenkrantz, having 82 chapters, written in 1587 after the older example written 1470, which being a corruption of a nearly Norwegian language is clearly exposed, the title of this law is Guta lag.]

While in the possession of either Rosenkrantz or Árni Magnússon, Codex B was lent to the historian Otto Sperling, who copied the manuscript (§2.1.2).

2.1.2 GKS 3363 4to

A direct copy of Codex B, written by the Danish historian and antiquarian Otto Sperling the Younger (1634-1715), is housed in the Older Royal Collection (Da. Gamle kongelige Samling) at the Royal Library in Copenhagen, shelfmarked GKS 3363.

It is clear from the quarto manuscript that Sperling copied directly and solely from Codex B. On the title page Sperling labels the manuscript as “Lex Gotlandica 1470 scripta”, while at the end of the main text (following the register) he copies Bilefeld’s final colophon “Anno 1587. 19. Maij D.B.C.”

As an antiquarian, Sperling was clearly interested in Guta lag from a scholarly perspective, evident in the making of the manuscript. The Old Gutnish text begins on the verso of the second folio, paginated as ‘2’ and continues on each verso side until pg. 122. The copy is careful, with very few corrections, and with marginal emendations in Codex B successfully added into the main text. Misreadings occur, however, some of which are consistently applied throughout the text: ⟨haan⟩ ‘she’ is consistently written as ⟨haun⟩, ⟨wir⟩ ‘we’ as ⟨wii⟩, etc.

A short biography of David Bilefeld can be found in the writings of Jöran Wallin, published posthumously (Wallin 1747, 162ff.).
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The recto side of each folio was originally left blank, intended for a Latin translation of the text, which proved an unsuccessful pursuit. Only the first three pages have been translated, corresponding to the first two and a half chapters of the Old Gutnish text, up to “tha en andra hafuer gart nya”/“postquam novas fecit alias” [when he has made another (church)] in chapter 2.

While the Old Gutnish version of *Guta lag* is marked by a careful – albeit imperfect – copy of the text, the Latin version is marked by constant correction, with deleted text struck through and corrections written above. The final quire contains a number of notes in Latin written by Sperling, including a list of the marginalia found in Codex B. Sperling had originally intended this quire to be the third, though he mistakenly began copying the Old Gutnish text on the recto of the first leaf, numbered ‘31’, instead of the verso.

Structure and Support

Materials  The manuscript consists of 70 paper leaves arranged into nine quires. The same paper is used throughout the manuscript, with a watermark containing a coat of arms of Amsterdam flanked by lions rampant and with the initials ‘G D’ underneath. The paper measures 210 × 160 and does not appear to have been cut.

Collation  I-VII⁸, VIII⁸ (wants 8), IX⁸ (wants 8)

Foliation  Starting on the second verso with ‘2’, the manuscript is paginated on the recto and verso of each leaf by the main scribe.

Layout  The manuscript is written in a single column, with around 27 lines per page. As noted above, the recto sides starting at the fourth leaf are blank, having been intended for the Latin translation. The written area measures 185 × 135, and the outer margin has been marked by folding.

Chapters are numbered with roman numerals preceded by “Cap.” and titles given on a separate line and underlined. Unlike in Codex B, each new statute also begins on a new line, are numbered, and begin with a section sign ⟨§⟩.

Binding  The manuscript is bound in an original paper binding measuring 210 × 165 × 18.

Condition  In general the manuscript is in good condition. The edges of the paper are rough and discolored, but there is no evidence of water or other damage.

Script and Decoration

The entirety of GKS 3363 was written by a single scribe in brown ink. The cursive script is characterized by deep descenders, including ⟨f⟩, and rounded ⟨ð⟩. Tall ⟨f⟩ is lacking.
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Some abbreviations are taken directly from Codex B, e.g. ⟨M⟩ for mark ‘mark [coin]’, while others are expanded, e.g. ⟨j⟩ has been expanded to ⟨et⟩, ⟨pstr⟩ to ⟨pre-str⟩, etc.

There are no decorations in the manuscript. It is worth noting, however, that Sperling indicates new statutes, which are numbered, with a section sign ⟨§⟩ where Codex B uses a pilcrow ⟨¶⟩ and no numbers.

Origin and Provenance

As noted above, GKS 3363 was written by Otto Sperling the Younger. For Peel (2015, 6) the year 1687 is “presumably the date assigned to the manuscript” as it is found in the catalogue details. However, no catalogue at the Royal Library contains the date 1687, which must be a misreading of 1587, found on the second recto as “CIƆLXXXVII”, and on pg. 122 as “1587”, both taken directly from Codex B. Considering the biography of the younger Sperling (cf. Bøggild Andersen 1942), as well as the provenance of Codex B, a dating to 1687 is likely too early for the copying of GKS 3363. In that year Sperling moved from Hamburg, where he had been working as a lawyer, to Pinneberg in Schleswig-Holstein, where he sat on the royal council of the highest court of appeal (Da. overappellationsret).

In 1692 Sperling became professor of the newly-founded knight academy (Da. ridderakademi) in Copenhagen, a position which he held until 1697. During this period he is known to have been in contact with Jens Rosenkrantz, whose extensive collection of manuscripts included Codex B. Sperling bought another manuscript, AM 902 b 4to, from the nobleman sometime between 1692 (when the manuscript was bought at auction after the death of Holger Parsberg) and Rosenkrantz’ death in 1695 (cf. Overgaard 1996, 274), and thus is may be possible that he also borrowed and copied Codex B during this period. It is more likely, however, that Sperling borrowed the Gutnish manuscript after it had already come into the possession of Árni Magnússon, with whom the antiquarian had contact in the first decade of the eighteenth century.9

9Peel (2015, 6) does not specify which catalogue, though in her dissertation (2006) she writes “confirmed by private communication (23/1/2004) by Palle Ringsted of the manuscript department of the library”. My own private communication with Erik Petersen at the library (11-23 August 2017) has confirmed the date 1687 is not found in the handwritten catalogue. Note also Erichsen (1786, 139) and Lise (1999, 352).

9A letter from Árni Magnússon to Otto Sperling dated 2 September 1707 describes the return of a different manuscript the Icelander had borrowed from the Danish historian; this letter is now held in Copenhagen, Royal Library, GKS 1112 fol. (Kålund 1903, 27).
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2.1.3 Kall 650 4to

A stack of paper quires in quarto in the Kall Collection (Da. Kallske Samling) at the Royal Library in Copenhagen make up the manuscript Kall 650, which is a direct copy of GKS 3363 and therefore a direct descendant of Codex B. Like its predecessor, Kall 650 bears the title “Lex Gothlandica 1470 scripta” on the first recto and the front matter “Exaratum Anno MDLXXXVIII” on the second, with the Old Gutnish text beginning on the second verso and continuing until the last folio but one (87v). The intention, like that of GKS 3363, was to create a side-by-side Latin translation; however, the Latin text was never started, except for the table of contents on 84r-87r.

The text of Kall 650 inherited some of the misreadings in GKS 3363, for example ⟨haun⟩ for ⟨haan⟩ and ⟨wii⟩ for ⟨wir⟩, and has added a few new errors (cf. Schlyter 1852, xix): ⟨Pavidem⟩ 2r2 for ⟨Davidem⟩ ‘David’, ⟨heylsu⟩ 2v7 for ⟨heylsu⟩ ‘health’, etc. Six of the misreadings on 2v (the first folio of the main text) are underlined in pencil and marked with ⟨v⟩ (Lat. vide ‘see’) in the left margin; it is unclear whether this is a later hand, or the same as the main scribe.

Structure and Support

Materials The manuscript is written on 88 paper leaves arranged into nine quires and measuring 250 × 165. The paper contains a watermark of a crowned coat of arms of Amsterdam flanked by lions rampant.

Collation I-XI8

Foliation The leaves are foliated 1-87 on every recto (bar the final, which is blank) by a later hand.

Layout The text is written in a single column, with 26-29 lines per page. As with the exemplar manuscript, new individual statutes begin on a new line. Except for the first two leaves (the cover and title page) as well as 84r-87r, no leaf is written on the recto, which was originally intended for a Latin translation. The written area measures 180 × 110 mm, with the right and left margin ruled in pencil.

Binding The quires are unbound and have never been sewn together.

Condition Moisture damage is evident, particularly in the final quire (XI). The first recto, which serves as the manuscript’s cover, is especially discolored.

Script and Decoration

The entirety of the manuscript is written in a single hand using brown ink. The script is a cursive similar to that of GKS 3363, though not identical; for example, the leftmost stroke of ⟨w⟩ is broken, resembling ⟨ʒ⟩, while Sperling’s ⟨w⟩ is made with a single stub on the first stroke. As in GKS 3363, tall ⟨ſ⟩ is lacking, although ⟨s⟩ often extends above the body of other letters, though never below the baseline.

Abbreviations are taken directly from GKS 3363, although the tittle above ⟨r⟩ is often omitted.

Like its exemplar, Kall 650 contains no decoration. New provisions are numbered and begin with a section sign ⟨§⟩.

Origin and Provenance

The scribe and early provenance of Kall 650 is not known, though as with the exemplar manuscript GKS 3363, the scribe must have had a scholarly interest in Nordic antiquities, and the manuscript is likely to have been copied in the late seventeenth or early eighteenth century. Before coming to the Royal Library in Copenhagen the manuscript belonged to the professor Abraham Kall (1743-1821), who during his time as professor at the University of Copenhagen (1765-1780) and librarian at the university library amassed a large collection of manuscripts. After Kall’s death in 1821, his heirs sold the collection to a bookseller in Hamburg. The librarian responsible for the purchase of Otto Thott’s collection, Daniel Gotthilf Moldenhawer (1753-1823), purchased 688 manuscripts from Kall’s library for the sum of 1000 rigsdaler for the Danish Royal Library (Petersen 1943, 29). The collection was catalogued the following year by Erich Christian Werlauff, whose entry for Kall 650 reads “Lex Gothlandica A. 1470 scripta.” (Werlauff 1822, xliii).

2.2 Other manuscripts of Guta lag

The remaining three recensions of Guta lag are known from four manuscripts only: one medieval manuscript each for recension α (B 64) and γ (B 65), and two post-Reformation manuscripts for recension δ (AM 55 4to and its descendant B 68).

2.2.1 B 64

The best-known manuscript of Old Gutnish, often referred to as ‘Codex A’, is housed at the Royal Library in Stockholm, shelfmarked B 64. This fourteenth-century parchment manuscript is the only extant version of the α recension of Guta lag (1r-42v), and the only medieval copy of the law text in Old Gutnish. Following the law text is the only complete version of Guta saga in Old Gutnish (43r-50v).
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Figure 2.4: Preface to Guta lag in B 64. Image: National Library of Sweden, MS B 64.
**CHAPTER 2. CODICOLOGY**

**Structure and Support**

**Materials** Codex A consists of 50 written parchment leaves arranged in six quires. The text block has been cut to measure 167 × 130 and the leaf edges are painted red. At either end of the parchment book block is a paper quire, originally quaternion. The first lacks fol. 8, while fol. 1, which functions as the pastedown, has become detached from the rest of the quire. The same watermark is found on fols. 3-6 in the first quire, 3-6 and 4-5 in the final, of three castle towers contained in a renaissance-style shield, likely dating from the seventeenth century.

**Collation** vii + I-IV⁸, V¹⁰, VI⁸ + viii

**Foliation** The manuscript was originally paginated 1-100 in brown ink on each recto and verso by the main scribe. A later hand has deleted the pagination and foliated 1-50 on each recto.

**Layout** The text is written in a single column, except for the table of contents on 1r-1v, which is written in two columns. The written area measures 120-130 × 90-100, with typically 19 ruled lines per page.

New chapters occasionally begin with an enlarged initial, usually two lines high, though three-line initials are found on fols. 3v and 7r; the opening initial on 2r is 5 lines high and flourished. Chapters have in-line rubrication are numbered by a later hand, likely Carl Schlyter, in the outer margin. New provisions are indicated with a pilcrow in red.

There are no catchwords Codex A, though quire signatures are faintly visible on 9r (B) and 17r (C).

**Binding** The manuscript is bound in a stiff vellum binding measuring 170 × 135 × 20 at the spine. Due to the tightness of the binding, the manuscript does not lay fully closed, but measures 35 mm at the fore-edge. Considering the paper quires found at each end of the parchment text block, the parchment binding likely dates from the late seventeenth century, when the manuscript came into the possession of Johan Hadorph.

**Condition** Holes are found in the parchment throughout the manuscript. A hole measuring 5 × 11 mm on the sixth line of writing on both sides of fol. 11 resulted in the loss of text: 11r6 reads ⟨aigh[u]⟩, where the bow of ⟨h⟩ is also missing, while 11v6 reads ⟨[oc] dragi⟩, where the bow of ⟨d⟩ is also missing (see also Schlyter 1852, 26 fn. 13 and 27 fn. 27).

Otherwise the holes in the parchment did not result in the loss of text, many of which predate the writing of the manuscript. Two tears in the parchment had been sewn on fols. 14 and 15, measuring 15 mm and 22 mm in length, respectively.
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The text has faded in many places throughout the manuscript, especially at quire boundaries, and has been traced over by David Bilefeld on a number of folia, e.g. 1r, 8v, 43r, and 50v (§2.3).

Today the binding is fragile, having completely detached from the front cover and held together only by two binding strips and middle band on the back cover.

Script and Decoration

The main text is written in brown ink in a single hand using a fourteenth-century Gothic bookhand (Da. ældre gotisk bogskrift; Kroman 1943) and resembles the script used in e.g. Swedish law books from the earlier period (pre-1370; Jansson 1943, 104-113). Ascenders are often forked and may extend into the margin when the first letter of a new line. Rounded ⟨ꝛ⟩ occurs frequently after rounded letters and occasionally as the first letter of a line. Tall ⟨ſ⟩ and short ⟨s⟩ both occur, the latter exclusively in word-final position. Both rounded ⟨δ⟩ and straight ⟨d⟩ occur.

Abbreviation is minimal, being limited to nasal strokes and roman numerals. Decoration is likewise minimal, though enlarged initials in red are often flourished. New provisions often begin with an initial highlighted in red. Ascenders and descenders occasionally extend into the left, top, and lower margins, decorated with flourishes.

Origin and Provenance

The exact date and place of writing is not known for Codex A. Schlyter (1852, i) dates the manuscript to the middle of the fourteenth century, with which later scholars tend to agree (e.g. Pipping 1904, 1; Jacobsen 1910, 6; Wessén 1945, xi; Peel 2015, 4). Although a single scribe is responsible for the entire manuscript, both Guta lag and Guta saga, the texts belong to two distinct codicological units. The saga begins on a new quire (VI), while the law text ends on the final verso of a quaternion (V). It is thus not certain the creator of Codex A originally intended both texts to be in the manuscript.

Schlyter (1852, i) writes of a dedication written by Johan Hadorph, the first to publish Codex A in 1687, that the manuscript was found some years prior, neglected in a church on Gotland. Schück (1932-1944, III, 181) supposes Codex A was given to Hadorph by the Swedish statesman Magnus Gabriel de la Gardie (1622-1688) in 1673; however, in a letter from the following year, Hadorph identi-

---

11Derolez (2003) would likely classify the script as Northern Textualis Libraria.
12It is unclear where Schlyter found this dedication, which has since been quoted by other scholars (e.g. Holmback and Wessén 1979, lxiv; Peel 2015, 4). It is not to be found in either of the two exemplars of Hadorph’s edition at the Royal Library in Stockholm.
fies the gift as *Visby Stadslag* in Low German, bemoaning that “det gamble Exem-pleret på Götiska, som jag seer fordom der waret, är förkommet” (Schück 1932-1944, II, 316) [the old exemplar in Gutnish, which I believe there has been, is lost]. Hadorph is clearly aware of the existence of *Guta lag*, “af hwilken jag en god copia af danska Archivo hafwer” (Schück 1932-1944, II, 316; cf. also §2.2.4) [of which I have a good copy from a Danish archive] yet his letter indicates he did not yet know of Codex A by 1674. In 1676 Hadorph moved his collection from Uppsala to Stockholm (Bäärnhielm 2004, 133), though it is not clear whether Codex A was a part of this collection or not at the time.

### 2.2.2 B 65

A fifteenth-century parchment manuscript in quarto at the Royal Library in Stock-holm shelfmarked B 65 contains the German translation of *Guta lag* and *Guta saga*. A sixteenth-century paper manuscript has been added to the back of B 65, containing the later Danish ordinances from 1492 (*Kong Hans’ Recess*) and 1537 (*Kong Christians Recess*). The latter, however, is incomplete, ending abruptly with “Røm-
mer och flyer” G 43v11 [If [he] escapes and flees] in the middle of the third ordinance.

Structure and Support

Materials  The manuscript consists of 32 written parchment leaves in four quires, followed by 11 written and five blank paper leaves (i+9+ii+2+ii) in three quires. Both the parchment and paper leaves measure 165 × 130, having been trimmed together and painted red on the leaf edges. Folio 32 contains a small 5 × 55 mm flap at the bottom of the page, which has avoided trimming, containing the final two lines of Guta saga. Following the 32 leaves are 5 parchment leaves which have been cut out of the manuscript.

A foolscap watermark, measuring 40 mm at its widest, is evident on most of the paper leaves.

Collation  I⁸, II¹² (3 and 8 are half-sheets), III¹⁰, IV¹⁰ (wants 10, 5-9 clipped), V-VI⁶, VII⁶ (wants 5, 6).

Foliation  Original foliation in the parchment section of the manuscript can be found on some leaves on the recto side written as minuscule roman numerals in red ink by the main scribe, though on most leaves this original foliation has been lost due to trimming. A later hand has foliated the parchment leaves 1-32 on the recto side.

Original foliation in the first text of the paper section of the manuscript can be found on the recto and verso sides of the written leaves, except for the first, by the main scribe, numbered 2-19. The second text, which begins on a new quire, has the first recto foliated with ‘1’, again by the main scribe, but the remaining pages lack original foliation. The same late hand as in the parchment section has crossed out the original foliation and foliated the paper leaves as 32a (blank), 33-41 (containing the first statutes), 41a-b (blank), 42-43 (final statutes). The final two blank paper leaves are left unfoliated.

Layout  B 65 is the only manuscript of Guta lag written in two columns. The written area of the parchment section measures 135-140 × 105 and was ruled to 29 lines per column. Only the final verso (32v) contains more lines: 32 in column a and 34 in column b. The five clipped leaves also originally contained 29 lines per page.

The paper section is written in a single column with an average of 19 lines per page. The written area measures 115-125 × 95.

Binding  The manuscript was bound in 1882, according to the library’s handwritten catalogue, who published his edition three decades before the binding, notes that B
three visible raised cords on the spine and red marbled paper on the front and back covers. The binding measures 173 × 138 × 19.

**Condition**  The text in the parchment section of the manuscript has faded at the quire boundaries, having been re-traced by David Bilefeld (§2.3). The final verso of the paper section is also darkened, much more than the first recto of the section (32ra), indicating the paper and parchment sections were together for some time before being bound in 1882.

Signs of wear and tear are frequent in the parchment section. Folio 1 has a 45 mm tear from the fore-edge, and the parchment is slowly pulling back into its original shape. Folio 11 has a larger, 90 mm tear from the top of the page, with the inside upper corner of the page beginning to roll inwards. Small holes are found throughout, some of which predate the writing of the text. Water damage is evident at the bottom of fol. 13 and some of fol. 12.

Five leaves have been clipped from the final quire of the parchment section (quire IV), with only 15-20 mm remaining. Traces of text are still visible, however, and it is clear that the same scribe was responsible for writing these leaves. It is furthermore probable the five leaves constituted a single full text, as the first three lines of the first recto are written in red, thus indicating a rubric, and the final twelve (possibly more) lines of the final verso are red, indicating a colophon. Assuming the text was also written in two columns, we may estimate a text of about 2000-2500 words.

The paper section is generally in good condition, though a large 125 × 15 mm water spot is visible from 34v-36r, which has caused some ink to fade; the text is nevertheless legible.

**Script and Decoration**

Both *Guta lag* and *Guta saga* are written in the same hand using a cursive script; ⟨a⟩ contains a single compartment, ⟨f⟩ and ⟨ș⟩ extend below the baseline, and ascenders loop to the right. Schneider (2014, 63) would classify the script as *jüngere gotische Kursive*, considering such features as the leftward curvature of the downstroke (extending below the baseline) in ⟨h⟩, an open tail in ⟨g⟩ or the two-storied execution of ⟨w⟩ and, occasionally, ⟨v⟩.

Nasal strokes are commonly used for both *m* and *n*, and frequently for *de* in the abbreviated form ⟨vn̄⟩ for *vnde* ‘and’. Monetary values are commonly abbreviated, such as ⟨pf⟩ for *pfenning* ‘penny’, ⟨Mř⟩ for *mark* ‘mark’, ⟨oفاق⟩ for *ore* ‘øre’, and ⟨šił⟩

---

65 “saknar permar”. Presumably it is from Schlyter’s description of the manuscript that Peel (2015, 5) derives her information of the manuscript “lacking covers”.

14*Guta lag*, which contains approximately 1800 words, is written on four leaves and a single column of a fifth.
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for silbur 'silver'; monetary amounts are exclusively indicated with roman numerals, including the crossed variants ⟨ɏ⟩ and ⟨ɏ⟩ to indicate ½ and 4½, respectively. Other abbreviations include ⟨ꝑ⟩ for pro in e.g. ⟨ꝑbıſte⟩ for probist 'provost' and ⟨ꝫ⟩ for e in e.g. ⟨gebůſſꝫ⟩ for gebůsset 'fined'.

Decoration is limited to red enlarged initials, almost exclusively two lines high; the opening initial, a three-line high ⟨D⟩ on 1r, is flourished in red and black. Chapter headings are rubricated, using the same script as the main text, typically with a blank line between the rubric and the start of the chapter. The explicit and colophon following Guta lag on 28v are also written in red ink. Individual statutes in Guta lag and sentences in Guta saga are marked with a red pilcrow. There is no indication that the rubrication and initials were done by a separate rubricator.

The Danish ordinances in the paper quires were copied by David Bilefeld, the scribe of Codex B. As in his Gutnish codex, Bilefeld makes frequent use of ⟨M Ṙ⟩ for mark 'mark [coin]' and roman numerals. Rubrics are written in red, with an enlarged red initial, usually around two lines high, beginning each new chapter. The second set of ordinances begins with a centered title in red.

Origin and Provenance

A colophon at the end of Guta lag (28v) gives the names of three men involved in the translation and copying of the γ recension, naming a patron, a translator, and a scribe:

dis Recht hat losin scriben her Johan Techewicz vischmeister czu Půczk vnde houptman czu Godlande. Vnde das hat der Erbare here Her Svnye eyn vors-tender des Spyralis czu sente Jarghen busen der stad Godlande brocht vs dem Gothnischen czu dürce. Vnde dat het gescrebin peter Warthenbergh van Costan vnde hat das ge endet an deme Suntage czu Palmen Noch gotis geburt also man schribet Jndeme irsten Jare noch xiiij. hundert Jaren amen. (G 28va18-b6)

[Johan Techewicz, Fishmaster in Puck and Captain in Gotland, had this law written down. And the honorable lord Lord Sunye, a Superintendent of St. George’s Hospital outside of the city of Gotland (i.e. Visby) translated it from Gutnish into German. And this was written by Peter Warthenberg van Costan and he finished it on Palm Sunday after God’s birth, as one writes, in the first year after 14 hundred years (27 March 1401). Amen.]

Johan Techewicz held various positions as bailiff in Lauenburg (1393), Dramburg (1401), and Neumark (1402), though exactly when he became captain of Gotland is unclear; Eimer (1966), 295) gives a terminus ante quem of 1399. The Teutonic Order, having taken control of Gotland in 1398, would have been in need of a translation
of the local law, thus prompting the highest-ranking official on the island to com-
mission it. The translator set to the task is only known by the name Sunye (Sune),
though as the superintendent of St. George’s Hospital in Visby, he is mentioned
in a number of diplomas from the first decade of the fifteenth century.15

The scribe, Peter Warthenberg van Costan, is known from another manuscript
Gdańsk (Danzig), Danziger Stadtbibliothek, Ms. 2146, containing religious texts
(Günther 1909, 188-189). The language of this codex is clearly Low German, which
Czajkowski (2005, 20-22) argues to be the scribe’s native tongue. The High Ger-
man of the Guta lag translation (which shows East Central German features) can
be attributed to the translator, Sunye, whereas the Low German features in the
manuscript must derive from Warthenberg (Czajkowski 2005, 22).

The written record indicates B 65 came into the Royal Library in Stockholm
under Johan Hadorph (1630-1693), who moved his collection from Uppsala in 1676
(cf. Bäärnhielm 2004, 133). Hadorph makes reference to the Germanica Versio in his
edition of Guta lag and Guta saga (Hadorph 1687), and an inventory of the collec-
tion after his death in 1693 lists five manuscripts pertaining to Gotland (Bäärnhielm
2004, 133), which likely includes B 65.16 There is no mention of B 65 in Hadorph’s
letter to de la Gardie in 1674 (cf. § A.1), however; it is therefore likely to have come
into Hadorph’s possession sometime around 1680, together with B 64.

2.2.3 AM 55 4to

A mid-sixteenth-century paper manuscript held at the Arnamagnæan Collection in
Copenhagen contains the Danish translation of Guta lag. Wessén (1945, xv) con-
siders the text to have been translated into Danish in connection with Kong Hans’
Recess from 1492 (§ 1.3.1), which declares the validity of Guta lag on the island,
thus providing a need for a translation which could be understood by the Danish
ruling class. Schlyter (1852, xvii), on the other hand, argues for AM 55 4to to be
the original translation. Schlyter bases his arguments on the frequent number of
changes in the text, which show the scribe hesitated in deciding how to translate
certain Gutnish terms. On 28v5, for example, the scribe originally wrote ⟨suoger⟩
‘brother-in-law’ in the main text, subsequently crossed it out and wrote ⟨brødre⟩
‘brothers’ above the line; changing his mind again, the scribe struck through ⟨brø-
dre⟩ and wrote ⟨suoger⟩ next to it, above the line, reverting back to his original
translation of OGu. feþgar ‘father and son’.

That the scribe was himself translating from an Old Gutnish original may in

15 SDHK (2015, nos. 15874, 15875, 17827).
16 The Royal Library in Stockholm now houses seven manuscripts pertaining to Gotlandic law: B
63 (Visby Stadslag, German), B 64 (Guta lag, Gutnish), B 65 (Guta lag, German), B 66 (Visby Sjörätt,
Danish), B 67 (Visby Stadslag, German), B 68 (Guta lag, Danish), and C 81 (Kong Hans’ Recess and
Kong Christians Recess, Danish).
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Figure 2.6: Preface to Guta lag in AM 55 4to.
part explain one of the most curious features of AM 55 4to, namely the large gaps left on a number of pages. While these gaps, which are found at the bottom of the page, often correspond with the end of a chapter, this is not always the case. A gap of about 5 lines on 21r and 11 lines on 21v, for example, are found in the middle of chapter 19. The entirety of 31v is left blank, following a gap of approximately 4 lines on 31r at the end of chapter 29.

The text of Guta lag is written on 3r-59v, following the title page, which bears the title “GVLLANDS LOVF” and the signature of the owner, Claus Christoffersen Lyschander. A table of contents, labeled “CATALOGVS CAPITVLORVM JVRIS GOTLANDICI”, is found on 1bisr-2v and is a later addition written by Lyschander. It is clear the table of contents is taken from the main text, though some chapters have been skipped, resulting in a misnumbering.

Following the text of Guta lag is an explanation of Gotlandic coinage using Danish equivalents, e.g. “øyre det er søsling” 60v2 [øre, that is sixpence], written by the main scribe. Finally, fols. 61r-65v contain an incomplete index of Gutnish terms, with reference to their location in the main text, also copied by Lyschander.

Structure and Support

Materials The manuscript consists of 70 paper leaves in fifteen quires measuring 205-125 × 160. A watermark can be found, consisting of a shield containing a fleur-de-lis.

Collation I⁴, II⁶, III⁴; the remainder of the manuscript contains a more complicated quire structure, with multiple gatherings placed within an original sexternion IV¹²(13-70, 32-67, 35-66, 40-65, 47-64, 52-63). These quires can be described as follows: V¹² after 13, VI⁴, VII², VIII² after 32, IX⁴ after 35, X⁶ after 40, XI² after 47, XII², XIII⁴ after 52, XIV², XV² after 66.

Foliation The main scribe has paginated 2-113 on every recto and verso from 3v-59r centered at the top of every page. A later hand has foliated 1+1bis-69 on every recto.

Layout The main text of the manuscript is written in a single column, with 17-21 unruled lines per page. The written area measures 155-175 × 130.

Chapter headings are written on a new line in a title script and are numbered with minuscule roman numerals in the outer margins by the main scribe. Individual statutes are not indicated with any special signs. On the first few pages of the main text, up to 11r, a later hand (Lyschander’s) has added the letters A-Z and again A-H in the outer margin at occasional intervals, providing reference points for the glossary added at the end of the manuscript.

Binding The manuscript is presently bound in a repurposed parchment measuring 215 × 160 × 10. The parchment contains texts from the Missale Romanum,
2.2. OTHER MANUSCRIPTS OF GUTA LAG

with red and green initials as well as musical notation (Figure 2.7). Over the missal the title “IVS GOTLANDICVM” has been written. A paper cover bearing the title “DEN GAMLE GULLANDS LOW” had once served as the outermost cover of the manuscript, though post-dates the title on the parchment, which has transferred onto the back of the paper. During restoration in 2013, this paper cover was removed and placed in a plastic sleeve.

**Condition** In general the manuscript is in good condition. There is no evidence of water damage.

**Script and Decoration**

The main text of *Guta lag* is written in a single hand using a cursive script, with chapter headings and other highlighted text written in a *fere-textura*. The script has a younger, more hurried character than the script in Codex B; letters such as ⟨a⟩ and ⟨e⟩, for example, are written without lifting the pen. Loops often cross through the ascenders, as well as the descender of ⟨h⟩. The bowl of ⟨d⟩ is open, while the leg of ⟨k⟩ sits at the midline.

The most common abbreviation is a long line above a word, which often indicates a nasal, though not always. On 5r alone we find this stroke above ⟨Sogne mene⟩ 5r16 ‘parishioners’ and ⟨tredig⟩ 5r16 ‘third, riding’, where the line represents a missing nasal, but also over ⟨amen⟩ 5r19 ‘other’, where no abbreviation is necessary. Word-final *er* is often abbreviated as ⟨r⟩ with a long flourish crossing back over the word; in the case of the common word *eller* ‘or’, this flourish often wraps around back and through the double *ll*.

Numbers are typically given in minuscule roman numerals, while monetary values are often abbreviated, e.g. ⟨søsling⟩ for *søsling* ‘sixpence’, ⟨mč⟩ for *mark* ‘mark (coin)’ (also in the meaning ‘field’ on 59r12), etc.

The *fere-textura* script used for chapter headings is also found on 12v5-6 to highlight the names of three churches Fardhem, Tingstäde, and Atlingbo (“det er fardim : tingsteder oc | atlingebo”; boldface indicates *fere-textura*).

---

The text on the front cover is from the *Office of the Dead*, though a shorter version than that published in 1474 by the Milanese printer Antonio Zarotto (see the edition in [Ward and Johnson 1998](#)). The text contains “Ego sum resurrectio”, “Domine Iesu Christe” (including the versus “Hostias et preces tibi”), “Annue nobis domine”, “Pro quoram memoria corpus Christi”, and finally “Omnipotens sempiterne deus” (cf. [Ward and Johnson 1998](#), 331-333). The back cover contains a part of the *Nativitas Beatae Mariae Virginis*: the gradual “Benedicta et venerabilis es Virgo Maria”, followed by the gospel reading “Extollens vocem quædam mulier” (from Luke 11), and finally the gradual “Felix es sacra Virgo Maria” (cf. [von Euch 1907](#), 904 and appendix 95).
Figure 2.7: Current binding of AM 55 4to, showing a repurposed parchment containing the Missale Romanum. Image: Suzanne Reitz.
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Origin and Provenance

The origin of AM 55 4to is unclear; whether the manuscript was written on Gotland or in Denmark is unknown. Two of its owners are known, however, one of whom may provide a link to Codex B.

On the title page the large, flourished signature “Claudius Christopheri F.” appears; underneath, given in parenthesis, is the surname “Lyschander” and the date “†1623”. The poet and historian Claus Christoffersen Lyschander (1558-1623/4), who owned the manuscript, appears to have taken a special interest in AM 55 4to, having written the table of contents on 1bisr-2v, as well as the register on 61r-65v. Like David Bilefeld, Lyschander was educated at Rostock, having begun his studies in 1581.\footnote{The matriculation registry entry for Lyschander is available at http://purl.uni-rostock.de/matrikel/100036605 (accessed 8-12-2016).}

Lyschander’s connection to Gotland (and, presumably, Guta lag) stems back to his childhood home of Norra Vram in Scania, where his father was the parish priest. Jens Bille, the sheriff on Gotland who employed David Bilefeld to tutor his sons (see §2.1.1), moved his family homestead to Billesholm (previously called Lyngsgård) nearby in 1571; when Bille died in 1575 he was buried at Norra Vram church, presumably by Lyschander’s father. The native Scanian’s connection to the Bille family continued well into his adulthood, when he was the parish minister in Herfølge from 1587 until his death around the new turn of the new year 1624, notably with Jens Bille’s son, Steen (1565-1629), to whom he dedicated a rhymed chronicle of the noble family, De Billers Iensis Sonners XVI Aner och Slecte Bog (Billeslægtenes Rimkrønike; cf. Rørdam 1888), in 1597 (see also Petersen 1938).

Both father and son were avid book collectors and, considering Jens Bille’s position on Gotland as sheriff from 1560-1571, it is not unreasonable to think the manuscript AM 55 4to first belonged to the Bille family, before coming into Lyschander’s possession.

What became of the manuscript after Lyschander’s death in 1624 is unclear, but in the following century AM 55 4to belonged to the book collector Frederik Rostgaard (1671-1745). The manuscript is listed in the catalogue of Rostgaard’s collection from 1726 (Rostgaard 1728, 487) as “413. Gullands Lovg. [Claud. Lyschandri fuit.] in 4to”. That same year, the collection was sold at auction (for economic reasons; see Ilsøe 2007, 108-111), at which point Árni Magnússon purchased AM 55 4to for 1 mark and 8 shillings (Kálund 1909, 98).

2.2.4 B 68

A seventeenth-century copy of AM 55 4to, containing the Danish translation of Guta lag, is housed at the Royal Library in Stockholm. This paper manuscript is
a careful copy, having silently incorporated the additions and corrections from the exemplar manuscript, although the scribe has frequently misread the abbreviation ⟨ɟ⟩ for 'half' as 'one'. Curiously, the scribe of B 68 also left gaps on the page in the same places in the text as in AM 55 4to, though unlike in the exemplar manuscript, these gaps are not necessarily at the bottom of the page.

While textually B 68 adds little new knowledge to Guta lag or Old Gutnish, being a direct copy of AM 55 4to, the manuscript plays a significant role in the dissemination history of the Gotlandic corpus; it was the first manuscript to come into the possession of Johan Hadorph, who would later publish the first edition of Guta lag and Guta saga, and is arguably the only extant witness of Guta lag copied by a Swede.

Structure and Support

Materials  The manuscript consists of 45 written and three blank paper leaves arranged in six quaternion gatherings. The paper measures 200 × 155 and contains a watermark (found in every quire) of a crowned coat of arms of Amsterdam flanked by two lions rampant, measuring 85 mm at its widest point.

Collation  I-IV⁸

Foliation  The scribe has paginated the main text 1-84, starting on the fourth leaf. The title page and two leaves containing a table of contents at the beginning of the manuscript are unfoliated.

Layout  The manuscript is written in a single column, 21-23 unruled lines per page. The written area measures between 155-160 × 120-130.

New chapters begin on a new line, with a separate line for the title. The manuscript also contains catchwords at the bottom of both recto and verso pages.

One of the most curious features of B 68 is how the scribe preserved the blank spaces found in the exemplar manuscript AM 55 4to. Gaps in the text, ranging from 30-115 mm are found on pgs. 25, 26, 31, 32, 45, 46, 55, 66, 70, and 75.

Binding  The manuscript is bound in its original laced limp paper binding measuring 200 × 155 × 8. A modern cardboard cover has been made for storing the manuscript.

Condition  In general the manuscript is in good condition. There are no indications of water or mold damage. Some ink smudges are found covering the text, though in general the text is still legible. The paper cover is heavily soiled and the spine of the cover has worn off, exposing the laced bands.
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Script and Decoration

A single hand wrote the entire manuscript. The body of the text is written in a seventeenth-century cursive script, while section headers are written in a *fere-textura*. As in AM 55 4to, the same *fere-textura* script is used to highlight the three church names Fardhem, Tingstäde, and Atlingbo (pg. 8), as in the exemplar (§2.2.3).

Origin and Provenance

B 68 dates from the early- to mid-seventeenth century. Schlyter (1852, XIX) argues for a Swedish scribe based on script and orthography, for example the spelling ⟨någon⟩ for Da. *nogen* ‘someone’ on pg. 29 (lines 10, 11; AM 55 4to has ⟨nogen⟩ both times). It is uncertain whether the manuscript was copied in Sweden or Denmark, though there are no indications of the exemplar manuscript AM 54 4to ever having left Denmark. Furthermore, Hadorph mentions the Danish archive in his letter to de la Gardie.

The manuscript likely came into the collection of Johan Hadorph by 1674, as he mentions in a letter of the same year to de la Gardie that he possessed a copy of the law from a Danish archive (Schück 1932-1944, II, 315). Of the three manuscripts of *Guta lag* in the Royal Library collection in Stockholm, B 68 is the only one likely to have been in a Danish archive. The manuscript was moved to Stockholm from Uppsala, together with the rest of Hadorph’s collection, in 1676 (see Bäärnhielm 2004, 133).

2.3 David Bilefeld and the manuscript corpus

David Bilefeld’s hand is not limited to Codex B; both parchment manuscripts show traces of his hand, meaning Bilefeld had access to at least these two manuscripts in addition to his exemplar. Bilefeld is furthermore responsible for the incomplete copy of the later Danish ordinances placed at the end of the German manuscript, and his hand is found in the other, complete copy of these ordinances.\(^{19}\)

In Codices A and G Bilefeld has traced over faded text. Though normally he is careful to reproduce the letterforms as they are found in the manuscripts, he also adds certain characteristic features of his sixteenth-century script, such as bows above ⟨ŭ⟩ and dieresis above ⟨ÿ⟩. In G this tracing is largely confined to 28v and 29r, being the transition from *Guta lag* to *Guta saga* and from quire III to quire IV, though it can also be found on 14rb27-29. In A, on the other hand, Bilefeld’s

\(^{19}\)In addition to the Gotlandic law texts, Bilefeld’s hand is present in *Guta saga* in A, having added rubrics and the annal-like entries at the end of the text (see Schlyter 1852, ii; Pipping 1904, 17-18). His hand is also found in another manuscript, Visby, Landsarkivet, 373 H 1, containing *Vårfrukyrkans i Visby inventarium 1585*; an image of a page from the manuscript can be found in Lundmark 1925, 176).
tracing is found on numerous pages throughout the manuscript: 1r (beginning of quire I), 6r, 8v (end of quire I), 14r, 17r (beginning of quire III), 18r, 19v, 21v, 28r, 33r (beginning of quire IV), 41r, 43r (beginning of quire V and Guta saga), 43v, 45r, 47r, 49r, 50r, 50v (end of quire V and Guta saga).

Figure 2.8: Bilefeld’s hand in A 17r5-8. Pipping (1904, 17) draws special attention to the form ⟨Berþe⟩ at the end of line 5, in which both the capital ⟨B⟩ and use of ⟨◌̉⟩ for the svarabhakti vowel are characteristic of Bilefeld’s script. Image: National Library of Sweden, MS B 64.

Bilefeld has also added structural references in both manuscripts, likely after comparing the text with his own manuscript Codex B or exemplar β1470. In Codex A Bilefeld has added chapter numbers in the form of roman numerals in the margins, both in the main text and in the table of contents. Not all are visible, nor is it clear that Bilefeld numbered all of the chapters, though at least ‘i’ through ‘viij’ are legible in the main text, while traces of up to ‘xv’ can be discerned in the left margin of the table of contents on 1r. Pipping (1904, 16-17) notes the numbering ‘i’-’viij’ aligns with Codex B, though he does not mention the numbering in the table of contents. Here the numbering begins to diverge from Codex B in the last three items, which correspond to chapters 14-16 in B, though appear to be numbered ‘xiii’-’xv’ (chapter 13 is not a separate chapter in A; §3.1.3).

Chapter titles or other indications of a new chapter not originally marked as such in A or G have also been added sporadically by Bilefeld. On A 19v Bilefeld has written ⟨Loyski⟩ ‘bald spot’ in the margin, corresponding with the start of chapter 20 in B. A few pages later he has underlined the words “har sum gangs” 22r12 [When the line of succession is broken] and added ‘27’ in the margin. The corresponding chapter in B is 26, leading Pipping (1904, 17) to question whether the number 27 derives from β1470. In G the corresponding provision is likewise highlighted: the first word ⟨wor⟩ 13ra23 (MLG wor adv ‘where, there’) has been underlined and ‘Tit’ (for Lat. titulus ‘title’) has been added in the margin.

Also in G Bilefeld has added, in red ink, a chapter heading in German: “van vnech|te kinder” 14rb margin [Concerning illegitimate children]. Only B has a separate chapter here (28). It is perhaps surprising that Bilefeld wrote this rubric in German rather than copying “Aff Thy Barn” B 26v15 [Concerning illegitimate children] as found in the β recension. However, the hand is undoubtedly Bilefeld’s,

\[20\] Lines 5-8 of this folio have been erased, having later been re-traced by Bilefeld; see §3.2.3.
as it displays the characteristic ⟨h⟩ as found in Codex B, the only example of this broken ⟨h⟩ among these additions. Elsewhere, including in Bilefeld’s other writings (the Danish ordinances at the end of G and the Inventarium 1585) ⟨h⟩ is formed with the shoulder extending from the middle of the ascender; see Figure 2.9.

![Figure 2.9: Samples of David Bilefeld's ⟨h⟩. Images: (a) Suzanne Reitz; (b) (c) Royal Library, Stockholm.](image)

Twice Bilefeld has added the Old Gutnish title, together with chapter numbers, under the rubrics in G: “G: Intect 25” 14vb28 (‘G: undoubtedly stands for ‘Gutnish/Gotlandic’) and “Aff Horj 26” 15va18. The chapter numbers do not correspond; Codex B has ‘29’ and ‘30’. Nevertheless, these chapter titles clearly derive from the β recension, corresponding with Codex B “Aff inteächt” 28r4 [Concerning being taken in (with a woman)], where Codex A has no heading, and “Aff hori” 29r12 [Concerning adultery], where A has “gierir man dr hor” 25v18 [If a man commits adultery]. Despite the chapter numbers not aligning with Codex B, it is likely Bilefeld added these glosses after having copied the Gutnish manuscript; the rubric “Hogsl. oc id.” in the outer margin on 25v in Codex B, written after the text had been copied, is taken from the German manuscript (§3.3.4).

Finally, Bilefeld is responsible for copying the later Danish ordinances written on three paper quires and placed at the end of the German manuscript. Despite not having completed the copy, Bilefeld was clearly interested in the text, as his hand is also found in the other extant copy of these ordinances, in the paper manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, C 81, including the title written on the cover: “Koning Hansis Recess | paa Gudlandtz Low | Anno 1492” [King John’s Ordinances for Gotland’s Law, AD 1492].

2.4 Discussion

The manuscript corpus of Guta lag is small when compared to e.g. Jyske lov, which is preserved in manuscripts numbering in the hundreds (cf. Skautrup 1933). Nevertheless, these seven manuscripts span a 350-year period, three languages, and four recensions of the Gotlandic law code. Although all surviving manuscripts of Guta
Figure 2.10: Opening of Christian III’s ordinances for Gotland 1537, copied by David Bilefeld. Image: National Library of Sweden, MS B 65.
lag are in quarto, they differ in support, layout, and decoration, speaking for a difference in intended use. David Bilefeld's interest in the law code is evident not only in the codicology of Codex B, but also in the parchment manuscripts, where he has annotated.

Drawing from the distinctions described by Ladefoged (2016) for the Danish law manuscripts, we find Guta lag Codices A and G clearly fit in the category of traditional manuscripts. Both are parchment manuscripts with enlarged, red initials, with the opening initial more intricately decorated than the others. Chapter headings are rubricated, though neither manuscript originally contained chapter numbers. Meanwhile Codex D, together with all the apographs (B₁, B₂, and D₁), may be placed in the category of scholarly manuscripts. All four manuscripts are written on paper in a single ink, and little attention is paid to decoration. In the case of D and D₁, the only decorative feature is the fere-textura script used in chapter headings.

Codex B, on the other hand, can best be described as a user-friendly manuscript. Emphasis is placed on the visual structure of the text, with rubricated headers and enlarged initials, as well as paragraph signs either written or highlighted in red to indicate new provisions. Individual chapters are numbered, and the table of contents is written with alternating colors and folio numbers, making Codex B a useful tool for easy reference.

It is clear from the codicology that David Bilefeld created Codex B for his own personal use. In addition to the codicological features indicating a user-friendly manuscript, we find continued use in the form of marginal notes throughout the manuscript, which were taken from various other manuscripts than the main exemplar, which will be discussed in the next chapter. Despite this continuous use, Bilefeld never completed the title page of Codex B, underscoring the manuscript as an object made for use, rather than display or prestige.

An in-depth study of a single manuscript is inevitably a study of the scribe or scribes. In the case of Codex B, we are lucky enough to know the scribe by name and profession, and the codicology further provides us with the intention behind the manuscript’s production. Classifying Codex B as a user-friendly manuscript has direct consequences on our understanding of the manuscript as a witness of Guta lag and the Old Gutnish language. Unlike the seventeenth- and eighteenth-century scribes of scholarly manuscripts, who aimed at making faithful reproductions of the text (cf. Hufnagel 2012, 113), Bilefeld was more interested in the content of the law which he was tasked to uphold. We should therefore expect Codex B to be a careful copy of the meaning and content of Guta lag, though not necessarily a careful copy of the Old Gutnish language.

---

21 Ladefoged (2016) does not include scholarly manuscripts in her discussion of the Danish law books, as her study only covers up to ca. 1500.
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Codex B contains a single text, the medieval law code of Gotland known as Guta lag. As I have argued in the previous chapter, David Bilefeld’s interest in copying the text lay in the fact that, at the time of copying, Guta lag was still the valid legislation on the island of Gotland.

Previous scholarship of the Guta lag manuscripts has mentioned nearly in passing that, despite being a younger manuscript, Codex B preserves an older recension of Guta lag than that found in the elder manuscript, Codex A (Schlyter 1852, xi, Pipping 1905-07, xvii, Holmbäck and Wessén 1979b, lxv, Peel 2015, 5). The present chapter examines the text found in Codex B.

The chapter begins with a discussion of the contents of Codex B as compared with the other manuscripts of Guta lag (§3.1), followed by a discussion of the possibility of drawing a stemma of the manuscript corpus (§3.2). The various marginal
notes added by Bilefeld and their possible origins are treated thereafter (§3.3). The chapter concludes with a discussion of whether Codex B preserves an older recension of *Guta lag* and what may be determined regarding the stemma (§3.4).

### 3.1 Contents of Codex B

Codex B divides *Guta lag* into 82 numbered chapters. Though not explicitly separated into sections (Sw. *balkar*) as in the Old Swedish laws, the chapters of *Guta lag* are arranged in a way that lends itself to sections, an idea first put forward by Schildener (1818, xxviii.) and, to an extent, continued by Jacobsen (1910, 7-11) and Wessén (1945, xxii = Holmåcker and Wessén 1979b, lxxvi). Here the idea will be taken up again that the chapters of *Guta lag* are purposefully arranged, which is especially evident in Codex B, where additions to the text are more frequently integrated into their rightful place than in the other manuscripts.

In addition to the 82 numbered chapters, Codex B contains 7 unnumbered rubrics, some of which are also included in the table of contents on 55v-57r. Codex B thus divides *Guta lag* into more chapters than the other codices: Codex A contains only 65 rubrics in the main text (numbered in the margins by a later hand), which do not fully correspond to the 72 titles given in the table of contents on 1r-1v. Often it is this table of contents, which aligns better with the ordering of contents in B than in A, that gives insight into the intended arrangement of *Guta lag*. To an even greater extent this table of contents aligns with the 72 rubrics found in G, except in the order of the final fourteen chapters (§3.1.9). D contains 83 rubrics, though notably these include the ten additional chapters not found in the other recensions (§3.1.2, §3.1.7, §3.2). For an overview of the chapter divisions in the four recensions, see Appendix B.

#### 3.1.1 Church Section


The preface and first seven chapters of *Guta lag* can all be grouped under the heading Church Section (Sw. *Kyrkobalk*) or Christianity Section (Sw. *Kristnabalk*). Sec-

---

1 Including the preface, which was originally numbered ‘1’, and one rubric added in the margin on 24v (§3.3).
2 One chapter, corresponding with 31 in B, lacks a rubric, though begins with an enlarged red initial on 26v7. A later hand has added a title in the margin (§3.1.2).
3 The table of contents on 1bis-2v in D was added by a later hand (§2.7.1), adding no insight into the intended ordering of chapters in *Guta lag*. 
tions on Christianity and the Church are frequently at the beginning of medieval laws from Sweden, Norway, and Iceland (e.g. *Äldre Västgötalagen*, *Gulapíngslog*, *Grágás*), emphasizing the role of the Church in the codification of the law.

Despite containing fewer than 100 words, the preface to *Guta lag* differs from the rest of the text linguistically, as noted by Pipping ([1905-07], xiv-xvi). Two of these differences indicate the preface may be a younger addition to the text, namely the use of OGu. þet conj ‘that’ for older et and the occlusion of gb > gd in ptc dat sg neut bygðu (bygdu) A 2r11 ‘inhabited’. The latter is notably only relevant for Codex A, as Codex B always shows this occlusion (§4.3.2), likewise the final linguistic difference, the use of ⟨ia⟩ in dat pl gierningum (giarningum) A 2r12 ‘deeds’, is specific to the elder codex (§4.2.3).

The seven chapters of the Church Section are held together not only by their content, but also in their phrasing. Each chapter begins with a variation on the phrase Þet ir nū þī nēst [This is now next], which is only found once outside the Church Section (Chapter 12; §3.1.3), and resembles the phrasing in *Gulapíngslog* (§1.3.1). Some chapters begin with OGu. þitta (Da. dette, MHG dis) instead of þet (Da. det, MHG das), though no two recensions agree completely on the distribution.

In general the Church Section is coherent across the four recensions, both in content and the division of chapters. The notable exception is Chapter 4, concerning priests and their families, which is longer in Codex B. Scholars generally agree these extra provisions are an older layer of the law, having been removed from the α, γ, and δ recensions. Peel (2015, 24) argues the provisions “must be considered in the light of the Synod at Skänninge in 1248”, which forbade clerical marriage, although celibacy among the priesthood was not fully taken up until much later (cf. also Pipping [1905-07], v). Indications of clerical marriage are still found in *Östgötalagen*, written after 1285, thus post-dating the Synod (cf. Holmbäck and Wessén 1979b, lxix and 1979a, 160-161 note 65; Schlyter 1852, vii).

Implying provisions from *Guta lag* were removed due to the establishment of celibacy among the clergy is not without problems. Not all provisions from Chapter 4 have been removed; all recensions contain the following concerning priests’ families:

> Þet ir nū þī nēst et prestr ok prestkuna ok prestbarn lērþ þā iru slīk at sleg

---

4Cf. also the provision in Chapter 30 “Tha en mader | gier yffuir hoor: lerder ella | olerder” B 29r15-17 [If a man, whether priest or layman, commits double adultery (i.e. if both parties are married), which also presupposes clerical marriage (Peel 2015, 145 note 21/4 and references). Codex A lacks lerdr ella [learned (i.e. priest) or], resulting in the striking reading “Þa en mandr gierir yfir hor olerdr” A 26r3 [If a man, a layman, commits double adultery]. Whether the words “learned or”, which are present in G 15v26 and D 32r4, were deleted from the α recension after the ban on clerical marriage (in which case, we should maybe expect olerdr ‘unlearned, layman’ to have been deleted as well) or merely due to scribal error or omission is uncertain.
[Now the next thing is that priests and the wives of priests and their ordained children (i.e. those that are later ordained) are equal in the matter of assault and manslaughter and in all respects to the children of farmers, but the lay children are treated in the same way as the family of their mother. [Peel 2015, 39]]

In fact, the only passages removed from recensions α, γ, and δ that deal with the families of priests state that the further descendants of a priest are to be treated as Gotlanders, with the same rights as a bōndi (‘free farmer’), and that a non-ordained son of a priest must defend himself in a legal case. The remainder of the chapter deals with the rights of the priests themselves, not their children, but has nevertheless been removed from the other recensions. Still, the preservation of these provisions in Codex B is one of the clearest indications of the β recension retaining older layers of Guta lag that have been removed from the other recensions (cf. Holmbäck and Wessén 1979b, lxv).

3.1.2 Peace Section


Chapters 8-11 concern personal sanctity established during certain times of the year or in certain places. As in the Church Section (§3.1.1), the chapters of this Peace Section (Sw. Fredsbalk) are held together by their opening phrases: Chapters 8 and 9 both begin “Nu ier en” B 10r12, 10v13 [Now there is still], Chapters 10 and 11 with “Tha ier sidan” B 11r6, 21 [Then there is furthermore]. These opening phrases form a bridge from the previous chapter (7), which concerns the sanctity found in the church and on religious holidays.

The four recensions of Guta lag show the greatest consistency in the Peace Section; the four chapters are arranged in the same order in all manuscripts, and are found in the tables of contents in A, B, and D. An extra chapter entitled “Giffte folkis ret” [The rights of married people] is found in D 12r10-15 following these four chapters; as the provisions in this extra chapter deal with the homestead, their placement following the chapter concerning homestead peace is perhaps logical.

3.1.3 Personal Rights

The largest of the sections, the *Section on Personal Rights* (*Sw. Manhelgesbalk*) covers Chapters 12-24 and concerns punishments for criminal acts of violence and other personal crimes. Containing some of the oldest layers of *Guta lag*, this section varies among the four recensions in both content and chapter division. Codex B has more chapter titles than the other manuscripts, dividing for example provisions regarding wounds into five chapters (19-23) where the other three manuscripts only have one. Codex B also divides the provisions on manslaughter into two chapters (12-13) where the other manuscripts have one. The Danish manuscript, on the other hand, has an extra heading in Chapter 18 for the provisions regarding the custody of children. Finally, Codex A is missing a heading for Chapter 24, both in the main text and the table of contents, found in the other three manuscripts.

The content of the personal rights section was under constant emendation during the validity of *Guta lag*, evidenced by the great variation among the four manuscript recensions. Codex D, for example, contains an extra provision near the end of Chapter 12, while no two manuscripts contain all the same provisions in Chapter 19 in the same order. Codex B has integrated two younger provisions regarding hair pulling into Chapter 20, while Codices A and D place these provisions after the explicit (A 41r17-21; D 59r1-5); the rubric in A reads “Hitta ier þet | sum nylast war takit vm loyski” 41r17-18 [This is that which has most recently been taken regarding bald spots], showing the relatively young age of this addition. In G these provisions are missing altogether.

Codex A groups chapters 19-24 together into a single chapter, including the provisions regarding slaves fighting (Chapter 24 in B), for which B, G, and D all have a separate rubric, though not identical. Codices B and D both take the first words of the chapter as the title – “Bers trel” B 23v6 [If a slave fights] and “Om en madz [sic] trel bliffuer slagen” D 25r1 [If a man’s slave is hit] – whereas G simply gives the title “Van deme drellen” G 12ra29 [Concerning slaves].

Chapter 24 shows little variation in content among the four recensions. However, the orthography of Chapter 24 in B – which includes four tokens with the diphthong ⟨ai⟩ (§4.3.4), the only token of OGu. huer pron ‘each, every’ spelled with ⟨e⟩ (§4.3.8), and the exclusive use of non-broken 3 sg pres ir ‘is’ (§5.1.7) – leads Pipping (1901, 75-78) to conclude this chapter derives from a different source from the rest of the main text in the β recension. The orthography resembles Codex A somewhat in the first sentences, in e.g. the use of ⟨ai⟩ and the only token of gen sg mans ‘man’ spelled with ⟨z⟩ (§4.1.4); it is possible Bilefeld copied this chapter from A, eventually adapting the orthography to match the rest of the text. It is further
worth noting that immediately following this chapter in Codex A are misplaced provisions from chapter 26 ($§3.1.4$), found in a marginal note in Codex B, though from a different source ($§3.3.1$).

### 3.1.4 Inheritance and Women’s Rights


Focus shifts from personal rights to property in the following section, which may be labeled the *Inheritance Section* (Sw. *Ärfdabalk*). Included in this section are provisions regarding adultery and the rights of women, which in the Old Swedish laws fall under the *Marriage Section* (Sw. *Giftobalk* or *Giftermålsbalk*).

Chapters 25-28 all deal with inheritance and form a single chapter in A and D, while B and G divide these provisions into smaller, though not identical chapters. No rubric is found in G corresponding with Chapter 26 in B, though David Bilefeld has underlined the first word ⟨wor⟩ 13ra23 ‘where’ in G and added ‘Tit’ in the margin ($§2.3$). Meanwhile the German codex has a separate rubric “høgsl oc iþ” 13va27 (notably written in Old Gutnish and not in German), which in B forms a part of Chapter 26. Taking the rubric from G, Bilefeld has added “Hogs|l | oc ID” [Support and employment] in the margin on 25v; neither A nor D have a new chapter here, nor is the title found in the table of contents in B.

The following four chapters (29-32) concern adultery and the mistreatment of women. B, G, and D all agree in the division of these four chapters, which also aligns with the table of contents in A; however, rubrics are missing for Chapters 29 and 31 in A, though a later hand has added “af | quinna | scam” 26v margin [Concerning the shameing of women] for the latter, where an enlarged initial already indicated the start of a new chapter. In G Bilefeld has added the Old Gutnish titles of Chapters 29 and 30, writing “G: Intect. 25” 14vb28 [G(utnish): Discovery in the act] and “Aff Hori: 26.” 15va18 [Concerning adultery]. The numbers may correspond with the chapter numbers of Bilefeld’s exemplar manuscript β1470 ($§2.3$).

B has integrated the provision regarding in-laws in bridal processions into Chapter 33. In A this provision is found after the explicit in the added chapter regarding woodland (Chapter 82 in B). This provision, which is missing in G and D, is likely to be a later addition to the text. On the other hand, it is possible the scribe of A had erroneously missed writing this provision in its rightful chapter; the scribe has similarly missed writing the rubric for the following chapter (34 in B), though the
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A younger hand has added “lag erfis | gernd” in the margin. B has likewise integrated Chapter 35 into the section on inheritance and women’s rights. This chapter, which is missing in G, is found at the end of A and D, though in different places. Curiously, both codices also erroneously include the provision regarding credit (Chapter 81 in B) as a part of this chapter. However, A and D both correctly place the provisions regarding wall hangings and riding clothes, a part of Chapter 35 in B, within the main text, despite the rest of the chapter being placed at the end. In D these provisions are given separate rubrics, while in A chapter titles are listed in the table of contents.

The final chapter of this section is arguably the first addition to the text (cf. Peel 2015, 8), having been integrated into its correct position in all four recensions (§3.2). B labels the first rubric as Chapter 36, while the following rubric “En | om ogutnish folck” 34r3-4 [And concerning non-Gotlandic people] is written in the line with no chapter number. Codex A has no rubric, though a corresponding title is found in the table of contents; rubrics are found in both G and D.

3.1.5 Immovable Property

Chapters 37-44 all deal with immovable property and may be placed in a section of the same name (Sw. Jordabalk). The opening chapter is missing in D and has been misplaced at the end of A, although the inclusion of the title in the table of contents indicates the proper location of this chapter (cf. Holmberg and Wessén 1979b, 275 note 1; Peel 2015, 202). In G a younger hand has added the marginal note “NB. abest in mssto antiquo” [absent in elder manuscript] on 17v, which may refer to A, if the scribe of this note had not noticed the chapter at the end, or it may perhaps refer to a now lost manuscript from the δ recension. Chapters 39 and 40 are found as a single chapter in both A and D, while in G these provisions are divided into four chapters. Similarly Chapters 42-44 all form a single chapter in A and G, although demarcations of a new chapter are found in the margins in both manuscripts for Chapter 44: in A a fifteenth-century hand has added a rubric on 34r, while the main scribe in G has added a pilcrow on 21v.

Chapters 37-44 all deal with immovable property and may be placed in a section of the same name (Sw. Jordabalk). The opening chapter is missing in D and has been misplaced at the end of A, although the inclusion of the title in the table of contents indicates the proper location of this chapter (cf. Holmberg and Wessén 1979b, 275 note 1; Peel 2015, 202). In G a younger hand has added the marginal note “NB. abest in mssto antiquo” [absent in elder manuscript] on 17v, which may refer to A, if the scribe of this note had not noticed the chapter at the end, or it may perhaps refer to a now lost manuscript from the δ recension.

Chapters 39 and 40 are found as a single chapter in both A and D, while in G these provisions are divided into four chapters. Similarly Chapters 42-44 all form a single chapter in A and G, although demarcations of a new chapter are found in the margins in both manuscripts for Chapter 44: in A a fifteenth-century hand has added a rubric on 34r, while the main scribe in G has added a pilcrow on 21v.

---

5 The text of the rubric has worn away near the fore-edge of the parchment, making it difficult to read; at best “Aff b00 | bythṛ” can be deciphered. The first word af prep ‘of, concerning’ is clear, while the final may be an otherwise unattested OGu. *byþi neut ‘swap, exchange’ (OItel. býti, Gu. böite), which semantically would fit in the context of inheritance.
3.1.6 Assembly


Chapters 45-48 deal with debt, money claims, and the process of assembly, and appear to form a relatively young Assembly Section (Sw. Tingbalk). Chapter 47 opens with the phrase Þitta í(e)r ok sempt sik [This is also agreed upon], which is otherwise only found in later additions (Chapters 35, 36, 70, 71, 78, and explicit; §§3.1.4, 3.1.9, §3.1.11), and all four recensions contain the same provisions divided into the same chapters.

A defective reading common to A, B and D is found in Chapter 48 (§3.2.3). In A a fifteenth-century hand has added “eygna dæyl0” 35r margin [sharing of property] next the final provision of the preceding chapter (47).

3.1.7 Cultivation

49. Concerning the purchase of men – 50. Concerning the purchase of oxen + If you buy a cow – 51. Concerning the purchase of horses – 52. If you ride another man’s horse – 53. Concerning the safekeeping of ships


Chapters 49-65 can all be grouped under the Section on Cultivation (Sw. Byggningabalk), though two of these chapters (54-55) can be argued to form a separate section on theft, and are therefore discussed separately below (§3.1.8).

The opening chapter (49), regarding the purchase of slaves, is missing from Codex A, although the title “Af cauptum mannj” A 1va6 [Concerning a purchased man] is found in the table of contents. This and the following chapters (up through 52) regarding slaves and larger livestock show a high frequency of OGu. þū 2 sg pron ‘thou’ (30/102 tokens are found in these chapters), including the only token of a suffixed 2 sg pron -tu in ⟨wiltu⟩ B 42v22 ‘wilt thou’, suggesting an older layer of the law (cf. Jacobsen 1910, 12-13). The titles of the chapters also frequently contain OGu. þū, though among the four recensions these titles vary between a phrasing “If you buy X” and “Concerning the purchase of X”, e.g. Chapter 51 “Caupir þu hest” A 35v14 [If you buy a horse] vs. “Aff hesta kaupi” B 43v10 [Concerning the purchase of horses]. An unnumbered rubric “Kaupir þu ko” B 43v5-6 [If you buy a cow] is missing from the table of contents in B; A likewise lacks a corresponding heading in the main text, although the title “Af cauptrí ko” A 1va8 [Concerning a purchased cow] is found in the table of contents.
The following chapter (53) is missing in D. Textual evidence indicates this chapter, concerning the care of ships, is younger than the preceding chapter:

Þā en maþr takr mans bāt at staþum, ok far miþ, þā bȳtir hann so sum hann riþi hesti mans. (A 36v6-8, normalized).

[If a man takes (another) man’s boat at the landing and travels with it, then he pays compensation as though he had ridden (another) man’s horse.]

Without the provisions regarding riding another man’s horse in Chapter 52 (which uses the pronoun þū), the fines for taking another man’s boat could not be understood. This reading, found in A, B, and G, is then arguably an addition to the law, having never entered the δ recension.

Yet the largest deviation in recension δ is found later in the Section on Cultivation. Nine chapters are placed between Chapters 56 and 57, three of which contain variant readings to provisions found in other chapters (Holmbäck and Wessén 1979b, lxvii). The first of these extra chapters, “Om gulladt” D 50v8 [Concerning golden headaddresses] is reminiscent of the end of Chapter 35, which is placed after the explicit in A and D and is missing in G (§3.1.4). The second, “Om pennigs øl” D 50v13 [Concerning beer for sale], would perhaps be better placed in the Assembly Section (§3.1.6), as it prohibits the sale of beer at the assembly. The third, “Om vaardt” D 51r1 [Concerning the watch], is an alternate reading of Chapter 72, which is nevertheless also found in D (§3.1.5). The remaining additional chapters in D all concern illegal chopping in another man’s wood or structures, and should properly belong in the Section on Immovable Property (§3.1.5).

The remainder of this section shows little variation among the four recensions. Chapter 61 lacks a title in G and D, while Chapter 63 lacks a rubric in A; the title “Af nautum oc russom” A 1vb3 [Concerning steers and horses] is found in the table of contents.

3.1.8 Theft

54. Concerning house searches – 55. Concerning the rights of thieves + If a man’s slave steals

Chapters 54-55, in the middle of the Section on Cultivation (§3.1.7), form a cohesive unit, which may be termed the Theft Section (Sw. Tjuvbalk). Although Codex B only numbers two chapters, in essence this section consists of three chapters, the final of which, “Stiel trell mans” B 46r12 [If a man’s slave steals] is only found in B and G. This title, which is unnumbered in B, is furthermore lacking in the table of contents. The main chapter (55) is missing two provisions in Codex B, one of which is only found in the Danish translation.
In the second half of the first chapter (54), Bilefeld has written the opening word, ⟨Tha⟩ 45v9, in red, indicating a new chapter. No such indications are found in the other manuscripts, however.

3.1.9 Final Fourteen


Chapters 66-80 warrant special discussion, as they are considered a younger addition to Guta lag, and appear in a different order in the various recensions of the text, yet always near the end of the manuscript. Holmberg and Wessnén (1979b, lxviii) consider the possibility of these chapters having been written on loose quires or leaves and added to the exemplar manuscripts (much like the Danish ordinances at the end of G), thus explaining the different order.

In Codices A and B these chapters are found in the same order, which Peel (2015, 7) considers evidence for a common ancestor of the two Gutnish codices (§3.2). However, if these additions were added to older codices on loose pages, there is no need for a single archetype of A and B with both the early text and later additions; rather, these additions may have been added to the α and β recensions separately.

Despite disagreeing in the order of these additional chapters, the four recensions largely agree on the division and titles, with few exceptions. Both A and D lack a rubric for Chapter 75, though the title “Af seþa lausu fulki” A 1vb13 [Concerning people with no arable land] is found in the table of contents in the elder codex. D completely lacks Chapter 71. G divides Chapter 73 into two chapters, titled “van hûseren” G 27va13 [Concerning houses] and “van hûs dyben” G 27va18 [Concerning house thieves (sic)], the latter being a misreading of the second member of OGu. hûs-jiauf ‘house-folk’ as jiaufr ‘thief’.

3.1.10 Later Additions

81. Concerning credit purchase from townspeople – 82. Concerning forests + Concerning mortgaged land

The two final chapters of Codex B (81-82) are later additions to the text, which should properly belong to the assembly section (§8.1.9) and the section on immovable property (§8.1.5), respectively. These chapters are also found near the end in Codices A and D, and are both missing from G, indicating a later addition.
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(1859, ix) and Pipping (1905-07, viii) further note the language of these chapters resembles that of Guta saga, thus younger than the remainder of the Guta lag text.

Only Codex B has a rubric for Chapter 81; in both A and D these provisions regarding purchasing on credit are found in the chapter regarding women’s dowries and adornment (Chapter 35 in B; §3.1.4), where they clearly do not belong. B also contains an extra provision regarding mortgaged land in Chapter 81, although mortgaged land is discussed in the following chapter.

Chapter 82 lays out provisions which should properly belong to Chapter 40, something which was already noticed by Bilefeld, who wrote “super 40” in the margin on 54v (§3.3.4). The second half of the chapter, regarding mortgaged land, is marked with an in-line rubric in B but unmarked in both A and D; one of the provisions is furthermore missing in D.

3.1.11 Explicit

Guta lag closes with an explicit emphasizing the legitimacy of the written law and stipulating that any new provisions regarding the Gotlanders must be agreed upon and written into the law. That new provisions had been added to Guta lag during its validity is evident in Codices A and D, in which the explicit is not the final passage of the law text, but rather followed by younger provisions. In A the explicit is followed by provisions concerning hair pulling (integrated into Chapter 20 in B; §3.1.3), woodland and mortgaged land (Chapter 82; §3.1.10), wedding toasts (final provision of Chapter 33; §3.1.4), women’s dowries and adornment (Chapter 35; §3.1.4), and buying on credit (Chapter 81; §3.1.10). All of these chapters likewise follow the explicit in D, albeit in a different order, with the exception of wedding toasts and mortgaged land, which are missing from the δ recension. Furthermore some, but not all, of the fourteen chapters considered later additions to the text (§3.1.9) are found after the explicit in D, speaking against a unity of these chapters. The chapters following the explicit, in the order given in D, are 74, 75, 66, 73, 70, and 80, followed by the other provisions discussed above.

Codices B and G place the explicit in its rightful position at the end of Guta lag, both before a colophon. In G the explicit is furthermore written in red, and opens “Hir endet | sich das rechtbüch der goten” 28va2-3 [Here ends the lawbook of the Gotlanders] instead of a direct translation of the Old Gutnish text:

Pet īr ok sempt sik: et þet īru lag som hier īru skrifāþ ī. Pet skulu allir menn halda. (A 41r11-13, normalized)

[This is also agreed: that these are the laws which are written here. This shall all men uphold.]

In addition, the explicit in G closes with an ending specific to the German translation:
[In the name of God, our Lord Jesus Christ, amen. Here ends the law code of the Gotlanders, translated from the Gutnish language into German.]

Colophons in B and G follow the explicit, though are specific to the physical manuscripts and thus not a part of the *Guta lag* text (see §§2.1.1, 2.2.2).

### 3.2 The Stemma of *Guta lag*

The first visual representation of a stemma for the *Guta lag* manuscripts was drawn by [Peel 2006, 24] and has since remained unaltered ([Peel 2009, xix; 2015, 8]). Figure 3.1 reproduces Peel’s stemma, though I have added sigla for the extant manuscripts and changed the recension sigla to maintain consistency with the rest of the present work.

As noted in the introduction (§1.3.1), the codification of *Guta lag* can be dated to the 1220s, represented by *GL* on the stemma. The first major alteration to the text, present in all extant manuscripts, is the addition of provisions regarding inheritance by Gotlandic and non-Gotlandic women (Chapter 36). [Peel 2015, 8] dates this addition, labeled *A₁* on the stemma, to after 1260, when Birger Jarl introduced a similar law of inheritance in Sweden, giving a *terminus post quem* for the archetype Ω of the extant manuscripts.

Recensions α and β, preserved in the Codices A and B, have been argued to form a subgroup stemming back to a hypearchetype ω based on two arguments (see [Peel 2015, 7 and references]). First, Codices A and B share a number of errors. Second, the sequence of the fourteen younger chapters of *Guta lag* (§3.1.9), labeled *A₂* on the stemma, are in the same order in the Old Gutnish codices. Both arguments can be rejected, however. The common errors in Codices A and B, which are mostly linguistic, cannot be conclusively excluded from recensions γ and δ (§3.2.1). The identical order of the fourteen younger chapters in A and B thus do not speak for a hypearchetype of the entire *Guta lag* text in these recensions, but rather, if anything, a hypearchetype of *A₂*, which would have been added to the already divergent recensions separately (§3.1.9).

*A₃* represents later provisions added to recensions α and β, some of which were also incorporated into δ (represented by the dotted line). These provisions are discussed in §3.1.10.

*A₄* refers to the ten extra chapters found only in the Danish translation (§3.1.2, §3.1.7), which [Peel 2015, 9] considers later additions. The hypearchetype of D, labeled δ’ on the stemma, refers to what [Wessén 1945, xv] argues to be the original translation into Danish, shortly after 1490. As argued by [Schlyter 1852, xvii] and
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Figure 3.1: Stemma of Guta lag manuscripts according to Peel (2015, 8). *GL represents the original codification of Guta lag, with later additions to the text represented as *A₁ through *A₄. *GS represents Guta saga. Ω represents the archetype of all known Guta lag manuscripts (ω in Peel 2015). The four recensions are labeled α β γ δ (w x y z in Peel 2015) and their extant manuscripts are given the labels A B G D with shelfmarks given in bold. Recensions α and β are assumed to derive from a hyperarchetype ω (v in Peel 2015). Broken lines (from Ω to δ and from ω to α) indicate a loss of provisions, while the dotted line from *A₃ to δ’ indicates not all parts of Addendum 3 has been included in the δ recension.
discussed above (§2.2.3), however, D must itself be the original translation into
Danish.

Finally, Peel (2015, 8) includes Guta saga in her stemma, as the text is found in
both A and G. For a stemma of these and the other Guta saga manuscripts, see Peel
(2015, 239); on the dating of the text, however, see §1.3.2.

3.2.1 Common errors in A and B

Central to the argument for a hypearchetype ω as an ancestor of Codices A and B,
but not G and D, are linguistic errors common to the two Gutnish manuscripts (cf.
Pipping 1905-07, xviii; Holmberg and Wessén 1979, lxvi; Peel 2015, 7). Pipping
(1905-07, xviii fn. 1) notes the following: annar ord num ‘second, other’: ACC
PL MASC aþra ⟨aþrar⟩ A 41r7, ⟨adrar⟩ B 54r7 (§5.1.2). – brauþ NEUT ‘bread’: DAT
SG brauþi ⟨briauþi⟩ A 40r18-19, ⟨Briaudi⟩ B 52v16. – flairi adj ‘more’: NEUT PL
flairi(n) ⟨flaira⟩ A 10v6, ⟨fleyra⟩ B 11v10. Pipping (1905-07, xxxvi fn. 2) considers
the possibility of reading SG flaira fulk [more people] rather than the expected PL
flairi(n) fulk. – inn ADV ‘in’ + AT INF marker: ⟨innat⟩ A 36v14, ⟨in | nat⟩ B 45r margin.
The token in B is found in a marginal note whose source cannot be determined
conclusively (§3.3.5). – matnaþr MASC ‘foodstuffs’: DAT SG matnaþi ⟨maþnaþi⟩ A
6v3, ⟨madnadi⟩ B 7r5 (§4.3.2). – skynia VB ‘to prove’: 3 SG PRES DEP skynis ⟨scyni⟩
A 34v9, ⟨schynj⟩ B 41r margin. Codex A cannot be conclusively dismissed as the
source of this marginal note in B (§3.3.1), thereby also the source of this error. –
þrīr NUM ‘three’: DAT þrim ⟨þrim⟩ A 37v16, ⟨trim⟩ B 48v15 pro GEN þriggia. The
provision should properly read ok þymi man þþ þriggia mana aþi [and restore
his honor with a three-man oath]. Considering the numeral directly follows the
PREP mþ ‘with’, which governs the dative (here aþi ‘oath’), it is not unreasonable
to consider the possibility of polygenesis, especially if the scribe had expanded an
abbreviation (roman numeral).

At least three further errors, not mentioned by Pipping (1905-07) or other
previous studies of Guta lag, can be added to the above list: kalfi MASC ‘calf (of the
leg)’: GEN SG kalfa ⟨calua⟩ A 28r8, ⟨kalua⟩ B 31v19 (§4.1.1). – skrifab VB ‘to write’:
PTC NOM PL NEUT skrifab ⟨scrifat⟩ A 41r12, (skrifuat) B 55r6 (§4.3.2). – vþr PRON
‘we’: GEN vþr, ŏr ⟨or⟩ A 2r13, ⟨war⟩ B 1⁵⁴r12 pro DAT OS (§5.1.6).

None of the above examples, however, reveal any information about recensions
γ and δ, and can therefore not be used to assert a hypearchetype unique to Codices
A and B. Many of the examples are specific to Old Gutnish grammar, such as DAT
þrim for GEN þriggia, for which it is impossible to say what the Gutnish exemplars
of G and D had. Likewise minor spelling errors such as ⟨briaþi⟩ for brauþi are
unlikely to have caused the German and Danish translators too much confusion.

Considering G and D are translations, we should not expect to find common er-
ors with A or B on the orthographic, phonological, or morphological levels, though
exceptions occur. In the Danish translation, for example, the use of -ft- in ⟨gifft⟩ D 28v19 ‘endowed’ must derive from an exemplar with a similar error as in ⟨gypt⟩ B 26v16 with p for þ (ptic acc sg neut gýt, gýt < inf gýha ‘to endow’), whereas A has the expected reading ⟨gyt⟩ A 23v16. Nothing can be said of the German translation, however, which has inf ⟨vorandere⟩ G 14rb15 ‘to change’. Conversely, the token ⟨brøthlinger⟩ D 42r17 ‘nephews’ points to an exemplar with a reading closer to ⟨br|yþlingar⟩ A 33v5-6 than (Bryllingiar) B 40r10, though again, nothing can be said of the German translation “dy bruder | kindere” G 21ra9-10 [the children of the brother(s)].

In order to collect viable evidence for manuscript relationships, we must move higher up the typology of variation, i.e. to the lexical, phrasal, or – for the best evidence – episodic levels of variation.

3.2.2 Lexical variation and the placement of D

Where Codices A and B show true lexical variation, the reading in D is most frequently a cognate of the reading in A. – ⟨laage⟩ D 4v2 ‘laid’ for ⟨legþu⟩ A 3r15; ⟨sagdu⟩ B 2r12 ‘said’ (defective, §4.3.7); ⟨brochten⟩ G 1va22 ‘brought’. – ⟨haffue⟩ D 8v4 ‘to have’ for ⟨haua⟩ A 6r8; ⟨fryra⟩ B 6v11 and (vûren) G 3rb18 ‘to transport’. – ⟨heim sogn⟩ D 12r8 ‘home parish’ for ⟨haim socn⟩ A 10v6; ⟨heim | frid⟩ B 11v11-12 and (hûs gewelde) G 6ra12 ‘home peace’. – ⟨osagid⟩ D 14r13 ‘guiltless’ for ⟨o sacar⟩ A 12r15; ⟨oschemder⟩ B 13v6 ‘id.’; “sunder schult” G 7ra20 [without guilt]. In the preceding provision ⟨oskemdt⟩ D 14r4 corresponds with öskemmdr ‘guiltless’ in both A 12r6-7 and B 13r8. – ⟨opi⟩ D 32v12 ‘scream’ for ⟨opi⟩ A 26v9; ⟨ropi⟩ B 30r4 ‘id.’; “schriende vnde rufende” G 16ra14 [shouting and screaming]. – ⟨verre⟩ D 39r9 ‘worse’ for ⟨verri⟩ A 31r6; ⟨forwarder⟩ B 37r8 ‘disappears’; ⟨vorerghert⟩ G 19r16 ‘damaged’.

One example from the preface to Guta lag deserves special treatment, as the reading in D corresponds with a word that has been deleted in A. No traces of this reading are found in B or G:

A  Oc hann [hial] þar þíhia | þet hann unni os ar oc friþ (2r7-8)  
   ‘And [help] pray to Him that he grant us harvest and peace’

Cognates of the reading in B, on the other hand, are fewer, and are often the result of Danish cognates of the reading in A having a different meaning or limited use.

6 Perhaps interpreted by the translator as Da. gift ‘married’.
7 That is, not lexical variation that could have arisen to possible confusion of forms, such as þar ADV ‘there’ and þær FEM PL PRON ‘they’.
– ⟨for⟩ D 30r5 ‘before’ for ⟨fyrra⟩ B 28r3; ⟨nussi⟩ A 24v15 ‘recently’; ⟨nů⟩ G 14vb26 ‘now’. Da. nys ‘recently’, which resembles OGu. mussi, is far less common than for ‘before’. – ⟨siger⟩ D 30r17 ‘says’ for ⟨segir⟩ B 28r15; ⟨queþir⟩ A 25r4 ‘id.’; ⟨vorsachet⟩ G 15r15 ‘deny’. Da. kvæde has developed a narrower meaning (mostly ‘to sing’ or ‘to chant’) and usage (chiefly poetic).

These lexical choices made by the Danish translator point to a recension which more closely resembled Codex A than Codex B; however, the above examples do little in the placement of the German translation. To identify the most probable grouping of the Guta lag manuscripts, we must turn to the highest level of variation.

### 3.2.3 Episodic variation

Peel (2015, 7; 71 fn. 32/12-12) notes a common textual error in Codices A and B in chapter 48. Holmbäck and Wessén (1979b, 282 fn. 5) note this defective reading as well, emending their translation based on the reading found in G as well as the following provision, where the full phrase is found in the Gutnish codices.

**B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Tha en han wil at segia: ta segia ater ‘fyri halffuan manad fram til tridiu’ (42r19-221)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘When he wishes to postpone, then he postpones within a half month up to the third.’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

‘fyri halffuan manad fram til tridiu’) firi halff manað fram || til þriþiu A 35r29-35v1; bynne deme | halbin mane vn ðe schele | noch den anderen richteltag | eynen halbin manen vort | bis an den dritten G 22rb24-28, for || halff maand fram til tredie D 45r18-45v1.

**B**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>B</th>
<th>Tha en han wil at segia, ta seggi ater ‘fyri vij. nata frest oc flyti vm vij. nata friest adra fram til tridiu’ (42v2-5)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>‘When he wishes to postpone, then he postpones within a seven-night limit and moves it another seven nights up until the third [week].’</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While A and B clearly contain defective readings in the first provision, this common error does not speak for an exclusive hyparchetype of the Gutnish manuscripts, as the same defective reading is found in D.

The two Old Gutnish manuscripts do contain some provisions, however, not found in the translated manuscripts. The extra provisions regarding in-laws and bridal processions, which are found at the end of A but have been integrated into chapter 33 in B, are missing from G and D (%3.1.4); presumably they had never been added to the γ and δ recensions. The following is also only found in the Old Gutnish manuscripts:

**B**

| B | Warder mader Berder med || luca haggom, so et synir slegir ieþru: ta Byter halff |
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Mark hraru slegh, | til fiugura: oc than med samu witñom som til sara (19r20-19v4)
‘If a man is hit with closed blows, such that the wounds are visible, then pay a half
mark in compensation for each blow, up to four, and then with the same witnesses
as for [open] wounds.’

Warðer maþ Berþe | miþ luca hag gum so et synir slegr iru. Þa | bytir half mark
huern slegh til fiugura oc | Þan miþ sama vitnum sum til sara A 17r6-9; ÷ GD.

Holmback and Wessen (1979, 262 note 9) and Peel (2015, 125 note 19/18) note
the lack of this provision in G and D, though fail to mention this provision has
been deliberately deleted from Codex A, only to have been traced over by David
Bilefeld (cf. also Schlyter 1852, 37 fn. 12, who merely notes a darker ink has renewed
the provision). Though Bilefeld’s hand is visible elsewhere on 17r in A, only this
provision shows signs of clear erasure (see Figure 2.8). We may then safely assume
this provision had at some point in the history of Guta lag been removed from the
law, explaining why it is lacking in G and D, and may have independently been
removed from these two recensions.

At the phrasal and episodic level, the Guta lag manuscripts begin to show a
grouping of A with D, B with G. For example, the following provisions are found
in A and D only:

A  en firi ir cuna | frels oc friþ wet (28r14-15)
‘if [she] is a free and freeborn woman’

e men for e | res quinme oc fri der uid D 34v19-20; ÷ BG.

A  huar sum nequar | af þissum brjautr. bytj. tolf marcr | landi (42v17-19)
‘Whoever violates any of this pays 12 marks to the land.’

hui{l}c| som | nogit aff thette bryder bode tolf mark | emod landit D 58v15-17;
÷ BG.

To this can be added the extra provisions found after the explicit in A and D, such
as the chapter on women’s rights, which also erroneously includes provisions for-
bidding buying on credit in both codices (§3.1.4).

Meanwhile, the two codices lack the subchapter “Stiel trell mans” [If a man’s
slave steals] found in B and G (§3.1.8). The following provision is also missing
from A and D, though present in B and G:

B  Tha en | mader ier lester at gangfempni ella | runfempni, ta ier Byt at ij. Markum
Silfs (20r17-19)
‘If a man is crippled and cannot walk or run, the penalty is two marks of silver’
CHAPTER 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Nota
Alternate
Cardinal
Cross
Corrections
defectum
Readings
Numbers
References

21r, 22v, 25r,
41r
11v, 12r, 32r,
36r, 37r, 45r
7v, 10r, 12r
25r, 30r, 41v,
54v (37v)
1bisv, 7r, 7v,
9r, 21v, 22v,
25v, 36r, 37r,
45r, 46v

Table 3.1: Marginalia in Codex B

\[ Wen \text{ eyner gelemet | ist an syme ganczen lybe | das her nicht geloufen kan | das ist gebůsset myt ij marc | zilburs G 10va3-5; } \div \text{ AD.} \]

Finally, the following is only found in A and G:

A  oc | raþi þaun mals aigandi huat ha
n he\]ldr vill. fe eþa lif hans (26r11-13)

‘And the claimant decides though what he would rather have: money or his life.’

\[ vnde is sta czu | deme wedirsachen welches | her habin wil lip adir gelt G 15vb14-
16; } \div \text{ BD.} \]

Considering the first half of this provision (in Chapter 30) ends with “eþa lif hans” A 26r11 [or his life], the second half may have been deleted via scribal error (saut du même au même) in recensions β and δ, possibly independently.

3.2.4 The groupings of the Guta lag manuscripts

Attempting to draw a stemma of the four Guta lag manuscript recensions, two of which are translations of now-lost Gutnish originals, based largely on common readings at the linguistic level is bound to deliver faulty results. When taking higher-level variation into consideration, it becomes evident that Codex B is not most closely related to Codex A, but rather to the German manuscript. Of course, this may be due to a common retention of older forms of Guta lag, as B and G frequently retain older layers of the text. On the other hand, the evidence presented above points to the Danish translation going back to Gutnish original with many common readings and errors as Codex A.

We may thus reject Peel’s (2015, 8) stemma, assuming instead a grouping AD:BG. Considering the collateral group consists of only these four manuscripts, it will perhaps never be possible to draw a more detailed stemma.

3.3 Marginalia in Codex B

Marginalia are found on 21 pages scattered throughout Codex B, all written by David Bilefeld. Schlyter (1852, xi-xii) argues for Codex A as the source of many of
these notes, as Bilefeld had access to the manuscript at some point (§2.3), though Pipping (1901, 75) argues for most — if not all — to derive from a third codex, which he labels X.

To pinpoint the origins of the marginalia in Codex B, we may first divide the notes into typological categories based on length, demarcation, and purpose. Here I propose the following five distinctions (see Table 3.1):

1. Three marginal notes are labeled *nota defectum* [note the absence] and a fourth *vide codicem veterem* [see the old codex]. Schlyter (1852, xi-xii) and Pipping (1905-07, 73-75) disagree as to the origin of these lengthy additions.
2. A number of notes give an alternate reading of a single word, preceded by *alias* 'otherwise' or *ella* 'or'.
3. At times Bilefeld spells out a cardinal number in the margin to provide a reading for an abbreviation using roman numerals in the main text.
4. Some marginal notes add rubrics or provide cross-references either within *Guta lag* itself, or to *Jyske lov*.
5. The remainder of the marginal notes are best considered corrections made by Bilefeld, likely after re-examining his exemplar manuscript, although the case can be made for another manuscript source in some instances. Typically a caret ⟨‸⟩ or dagger ⟨†⟩ indicates the placement of the note within the text.

Each of these five types of marginal notes in Codex B is discussed separately in the following sections.

### 3.3.1 Nota defectum

Three marginal notes containing one or two full provisions are preceded by the label “Nota defectum” [note the absence] on 22v, 25r, and 41r. A fourth note, also containing a full provision, is found on 21r, labeled “vide codicem veterem” [see the old codex]. Schlyter (1852, xi-xii) presumes Bilefeld corrected the text with these marginal notes after collating his copy with the exemplar manuscript β1470. Pipping (1901, 73-75) disagrees and also rejects Codex A as the source (with the possible exception of 41r), positing the lost Codex Χ instead.

For Pipping (1905-07, 74f.), the variation between these marginal notes in B and the corresponding provisions in A provides significant evidence to rule out the older codex as the source. Neither could β1470 be the source, says Pipping, considering such forms as ⟨ir(u)⟩, ⟨thair⟩, and ⟨nequat⟩, since Codex B typically has ⟨ier(u)⟩, ⟨their⟩, and ⟨naquat⟩:

B  § Tha en  lima | lastir fylgia | da Byter ij. | *Markr Sylffs.* (21r)
   § ha en | lima lastir fylgia. ha bytir ij. *markr sillfs.* (A 18r18-19)

‘When dismemberment follows, then pay 2 marks of silver in compensation.’
'When the bald patch is so large that the palm can be placed on it, the [the compensation] is 2 marks in coin.'

'When the line of succession is broken, then the relatives inherit each their share [including daughters] up to the fourth generation. If more distant relatives, then they take an eighth after debts are paid [and the women’s shares are taken out]. But a woman takes [ↄ: women take] the same from the farm which [she] had [there] when it was written down the first year. If it is not written down, [then] the farm has testimony.'

‘If they have multiple estates, then the son travels to one of them to settle the account, if he wishes, as long as the father proves not to be incapacitated. When a non-Gotlander has sons, married or unmarried, then they never receive a share from their father, unless the father proves incapacitated.’

Indeed, the high frequency of ⟨ai⟩ and the unbroken forms ir(u) in these marginal notes speaks against B1470 as the source. Likewise, significant phrasal variation is found in the note on 25r; “mid Burnum” and “oc qwinna lutir iru ut rettadir” are both missing from Codex A, ruling out the older codex as the source of this note.

On the other hand, the variation between the remaining marginal notes in B and the corresponding provisions in A are largely orthographic. The use of ⟨th⟩ or ⟨d⟩ in B for ⟨þ⟩ in A need not speak against Codex A as the source; ⟨þ⟩ is found once
in the marginal note on 41r, which otherwise has ⟨th⟩ or ⟨d⟩. It is possible Bilefeld adapted familiar terms such as þā ‘then’ and maþr ‘man’ into ⟨tha⟩ and ⟨mad⟩, while the less familiar eþa ‘or’, the only token of this lemma in Codex B (§6.2.2), was copied exactly. Elsewhere in the same note Bilefeld appears to have adapted the text using his native Danish; two such Danicisms are “om hand will” for en hann vil (OGu. um is otherwise never found in the meaning ‘if’) and ⟨mand⟩ for maþr. Meanwhile, the common error 3 sg pres skyni ‘proves’ for dep skynis in the same note speaks for Codex A as the source.

Thus while the marginal note on 25r decidedly cannot derive from Codex A, the note on 41r most likely does. The remaining two notes are unfortunately too short to assert one way or the other. Pipping ([1901], 73-74) expresses a similar sentiment regarding marginal notes argued by Schlyter to derive from Codex A, discussed in §3.3.5.

3.3.2 Alternate readings

In seven marginal notes Bilefeld provides a synonym or other alternate word for the reading in the main text. Five of the notes are preceded by Lat. alias ‘otherwise’, indicating Bilefeld understood these alternate readings to be somewhat synonymous. The remaining two are preceded by OGu. ella ‘or’, allowing the alternate reading to be an extension of the original, rather than a replacement.

Schlyten ([1852], xii and fn. 8) considers the possibility of the following three originating from Codex A:

8 D has ⟨oc⟩ D 12v5 for the second token only.

9 §4.3.7

A fourth example may be added to this list, if we allow for the possibility of Bilefeld writing ⟨w⟩ where his exemplar had ⟨v⟩:
None of these readings can conclusively be attributed to Codex A, even disregarding their brevity. The addition of ok in the first example (both in the margin and above the line) aligns with all other recensions, and could have derived from any manuscript. As the sentence in question is a list of the three churches given special status, ok ‘and’ is in any case a more obvious choice than ella ‘or’; we must not rule out the possibility of Bilefeld emending the text from his own intuition.

For the second example we cannot ignore the German reading døgen ‘to endure’, which aligns semantically better with OGu. hula ‘to endure’, the reading in A, than with unna ‘to allow’, the original reading in B. Sunye’s translation must go back to an Old Gutnish original with hula, which we may then expect in more recensions, including Codex X, another possible source of the marginal note in B.

The third example relies on linguistic differences between A and B (§4.3.7), which are rarely visible in translation. The reading fult in D may point to an exemplar with ⟨u⟩, though such a suggestion is at best speculative.

Recension δ is an equally likely candidate as Codex A for the fourth example. The exemplar behind vorergeren in G could be OGu. forvarþa, though it is not necessarily so; that both lexemes begin with the prefix for- (MLG vor-) may be purely coincidental.

Schlyter (1852, xii fn. 49) points out one marginal note which decisively cannot derive from A:

Both A and the δ recension can be ruled out as the source of ⟨warda⟩. The reading geschên ‘to happen’ in G may point to an exemplar with verþa, varþa ‘to happen’, though not conclusively; geschên may otherwise be a translation of OGu. at bieras ‘to come to pass’. For the other tokens of at bieras in Codex A (39v13 in Guta lag and 50r14 in Guta saga), the German translation has werden G 28ra15 ‘to become’ and gevallen G 32vb19 ‘to befall’.

Two marginal notes on 36r give the synonyms OGu. aiga and hafa in the sense ‘to own’. All three other manuscripts use hafa or a cognate:

10 Read en.
11 §6.2.2
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B thæ | en fleirin ‘eyga’ ‘ella hafa’ gard auman (36r12-13)
‘If more own [or have] a derelict farm’

ʻeyga’ ] hafa A 30r19; habin G 18vb17; haffue D 38r6.
B vtan han ‘hafl|ui’ ‘ella eygir’ sielffuir laggiertan gard (36r16-17)
‘unless he himself has [or owns] a legally enclosed farm’

‘hafl|ui’ ] hafi A 30v2; hat G 18vb23; haffuer D 38r9.

Pipping (1901, 75) notes the spelling ⟨eygir⟩ in the second example agrees with the orthography of β1470, though not with Codex X, which he argues used ⟨ai⟩. On the other hand, the spelling ⟨hafa⟩ in the first example matches Codex A, whereas Bilefeld tends to spell the inf ⟨haffua⟩ (43 tokens); ⟨hafa⟩ is only found in marginalia (36r, 41r). It is possible that only ⟨hafa⟩ is taken from another manuscript, and that Bilefeld added ⟨eygir⟩ on the same page in order to align the phrasing hafl|ui ella eygir [have or own] with the previous provision’s aiga ella hafa [own or have].

3.3.3 Cardinal Numbers

Four marginal notes are cardinal numbers written fully where the main text has roman numerals. In each of the four instances Codex A has a fully written token, suggesting the possibility of Bilefeld taking these readings from this codex:

B ta Byti drotin fyri | theim ‘iij.3 ‘tria’ oyra (7v14-15)
‘Then the master pays 3 [three] øre in compensation for them.’

‘iij.3 ] þria A 7r8; iij G 3vb28; iii D 8v8.
B thar | liggia wider ‘iij.3 ‘triæ’ Markr (10r1-2)
‘Lay therewith 3 [three] marks.’

‘iij.3 ] þriar A 9r6; iij G 5ra14; iii D 10v1.
B med ‘iij.3 ‘trim’ Markum (10r9)
‘with 3 [three] marks’

‘iij.3 ] þrim A 9r11; iij G 5ra25; iii D 10v9.
B vm ‘.xl.3 ‘fiauratighi’ netri (12r1)
‘for 40 [forty] nights’

‘.xl.3 ] fiauratighi A 10v14; xl. G 6ra27; firitiueffue D 12v2.

Positing Codex A as the source of these four marginal notes has implications on David Bilefeld’s method of copying the Old Gutnish language. In the three tokens
for the number ‘three’ he writes ⟨t⟩ where A has ⟨þ⟩. This may be due to his consistency in writing OGu. þrīr with ⟨t⟩, which he does in all 62 tokens. In the third token Bilefeld writes out ⟨m⟩ where A abbreviates with ⟨þ⟩, which he does in all 62 tokens. Considering the relative frequency of dat þrim, which occurs in 15 tokens in B as ⟨trim⟩, we should nevertheless expect Bilefeld knew the ending should be -m and not -n.

In the fourth token Bilefeld’s intervocalic ⟨gh⟩ corresponds with ⟨g⟩ in Codex A. Bilefeld often writes ⟨gh⟩ in this position, yet he writes ⟨g⟩ five times more frequently. Though the evidence is inconclusive (the available data is in many ways too small to draw stern conclusions) the use of ⟨gh⟩ in this token favors a source manuscript with ⟨gh⟩.

That Bilefeld wrote these four marginal notes at all is curious, considering he only does so for four of the 217 tokens with roman numerals. These notes appear in chapters with a high frequency of other marginalia and in-line correction, suggesting they were done at the same time, and perhaps from the same source.

The first example occurs in chapter 5, where we also find the in-line additions ⟨vm⟩ 7r18 and ⟨than⟩ 7v8, corresponding with ⟨vm⟩ A 6v14 and ⟨þau⟩ A 7r3 in the older codex, from which Bilefeld could have copied if we assume he copied ⟨th⟩ for ⟨þ⟩ (§3.3.2) and misread ⟨u⟩ as ⟨n⟩ (§3.3.6). In the same page we also find the marginal note “fyri thai...” 7v and on the preceding recto “fiscum oc fughlum” 7r, for which Codex A is a dubious candidate (§3.3.5).

The second and third examples both occur in chapter 7, where we also find the marginal note on 9r, which may derive from A (§3.3.5). In the following chapter, though on the same page as the marginal notes ⟨triar⟩ and ⟨trim⟩, Bilefeld has also added ⟨andrir⟩ 10r12 above the line, which corresponds with an identical ⟨andrir⟩ A 9r12 in the older codex, though may merely be from the main exemplar β1470.

The final example occurs in chapter 12, the same chapter as the marginal note “al: warda” 11v, which cannot derive from A (§3.3.2).

The question of where Bilefeld derived these notes – if he copied them from another manuscript at all – and why he expanded four cardinal numbers thus remains an open one.

### 3.3.4 Cross-references

David Bilefeld copied Codex B for his own private use, as his position required he uphold the active law of Gotland (§2.1.1). This is especially evident in the marginal notes where Bilefeld signposts laws or provisions, referring either to Guta lag itself or to Jyske lov from his native Jutland.

On 25v in the outer margin Bilefeld has added the rubric “Hogsl. oc id.” [Support and employment] where the main text shows no indication of a new chapter, occurring rather in the middle of Chapter 26. Neither are there indications of a new chapter in A 22v or D 27v, nor do any of the manuscripts refer to such a chap-
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Figure 3.2: Rubric “høgsl oc iþ” G 13va27 [Support and employment]. In column b the rubric “van erbgud der wibe” G 13vb20 [Concerning women’s inheritance] (Chapter 27 in B) follows the more typical practice in the German codex, with a blank line left between the rubric and the opening sentence, which begins with a two-line initial. Image: National Library of Sweden, MS B 65.

Despite these peculiarities, the rubric in G was written by the main scribe. Since Bilefeld had access to the manuscript at some point (cf. §2.3), G is likely the source of the rubric in B, providing another example of Bilefeld replacing ⟨þ⟩.

Chapter 82 contains provisions related to those found in chapter 40, both regarding woodland, a fact which was not lost on Bilefeld. In the right margin on 54v, next to chapter 82, Bilefeld has noted “supדר 40”, giving reference back to the earlier chapter. This cross-reference was clearly written at a later date than the main text, with a smaller pen, which may indicate Bilefeld needed to refer to such laws on forests during his time as priest and superintendent. A small cross ‘+’ on 37v14, immediately above the rubric for chapter 40, may be a related signpost for this cross-reference.

Bilefeld’s familiarity with Jyske lov is evident in three marginal notes referencing the Danish law. Schlyter (1852, xii and 71 fn. 52) mentions the first of two marginal notes found on 41v, while Pipping (1901, 73) identifies the second as also stemming from the table of contents. Only G contains a rubric for the chapter, though both its placement and text are peculiar. The rubric is found on 13va27 (see Figure 3.2) following the first sentence of the chapter with the second sentence beginning immediately on the next line (13va28), whereas other rubrics in G are typically written on a new line with a blank line left between the rubric and the start of the chapter (cf. §2.2.2). Furthermore, the rubric reads “høgsl oc iþ” in Old Gutnish, instead of being translated into German.

12 “das ist ouch der goten | recht [...] vor ere betrachtunge” 13va23-27 [That is also the law of the Gotlanders (…) for her support].

13 The term “høgsl oc iþ” is found again untranslated on 13vb8; later in the same manuscript høgsl is defined with “das | ist vorbesserunge eres rechtes” 15va4-6 [That is the betterment of her rights]. On the etymology of OGu. høgsl, see pg. 150 fn. 60.
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from the same source. Both notes provide titles for the relevant chapter:

B farer Bon|di y kiøb|fard. | Lib. 1. cap. | 12. ivtorum (41v)
‘If a free farmer travels on a business venture. Jyske lov Book 1, Ch. 12.’

B Titul|us | hvad fa|der tørff Barn giff|ue (41v)
‘Title: What a father ought to give his child’

The first note is written at the top of 41v, which begins with the final provision of Chapter 43. The provision, which deals with how brothers should share profits from an undivided inheritance, seems misplaced in the Guta lag text (cf. Holmbäck and Wessen 1979, 280 note 25). It begins with an enlarged red initial ⟨T⟩ in Codex B, but is unmarked in the other manuscripts. The marginal note refers to book 1, chapter 12 of the Danish law text (see Skautrup 1933, 44-45), which describes how an inheritance should be divided if a son earns money abroad.

The second note is written next to chapter 44 and refers to book 1, chapter 14 in Jyske lov (see Skautrup 1933, 47). The chapter is only marked as such in Codex B, although later hands have marked the start of the chapter in both A and G (§3.1.5). The final two letters in ⟨giffue⟩ are difficult to read in the marginal note, and resemble the letter ⟨m⟩. Schlyter (1852, 71 fn. 58) reads the form as ⟨giffua⟩, which Pipping (1901, 73) emends to ⟨giffue⟩. Considering the form is in Danish and was copied by a Danish scribe, Pipping’s reading is preferred.

Neither of the titles given in the marginal notes on 41r align with the base text manuscript used by Skautrup (1933, 44-45; 47) for this part of the law. Of the manuscripts given in the critical apparatus, the marginal notes in Codex B most closely resemble those found in Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 442 12mo (A¹¹ in the apparatus). The rubrics in this late-fifteenth-century manuscript read “ffarer | bonde søn kiøbfardh” 9r-10 [If the son of a free farmer travels on a business venture] and “Hvad | ffafer tørff ey giffue sit barn” 9v-13-15 [What a father ought not give his child]. Whatever manuscript Bilefeld drew his marginalia from must be somewhat closely related to AM 442 12mo.

A third reference to Jyske lov is not mentioned as such in any previous scholarship (although Pipping 1901, 31 transcribes the note in his edition of Codex B). Unlike the two mentioned above, this third example does not give a title to the chapter, but merely references the location of a related provision in the Danish law code.

B Wald: | lib. 2. Tit. | 16. (30r)

‘Wald:’ is an abbreviation for Waldemar, referring to Valdemar Sejr (Valdemar II, 1170-1241), who codified Jyske lov. The marginal note, which is written next to chapter 31, refers to book 2, chapter 16 of Jyske lov. This and the following chapter

14Copenhagen, Royal Library, NKS 295 8vo.
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(Skautrup [1933], 166-171) both deal with rape of women, the topic of chapter 31 in Codex B, although the processes differ.

3.3.5 Corrections

The remaining marginal notes are, as with those discussed in §3.3.1, corrections made by Bilefeld after having compared the text with his exemplar or another manuscript (e.g. A or X). These marginal notes can be sub-divided into two groups: shorter corrections, consisting single words only, many of which Bilefeld likely overlooked in his initial copy; and longer notes, consisting of full phrases.

Shorter marginal notes must be considered together with words added above the line in the body of the main text. Most of these emendations were presumably taken from the exemplar manuscript, added by Bilefeld either during the initial copying or after later collation with β1470. Two emendations of this type are found in the margins:

B Ey ma wisa spiellvm a annars ‘gard’ aujman (36r17-19)
‘One may not point out a defect in another’s inadequate fence.’

B Ta | en agripir ier engin til ‘vtan’ wes (46v12-13)
‘If there are no stolen goods [i.e. material evidence] but only suspicion’

As with most words added above the line, these marginal notes are marked with a caret ⟨‸⟩ indicating where they belong in the text. While the first note may have been added during the main copying, the second was clearly added later, as ⟨vtan⟩ is written in red ink. Notably, this addition occurs in the subchapter “Stiel trell mans” (in Chapter 55), meaning the correction cannot have derived from Codex A, which lacks this portion of the law (§3.1.8).

A third note, indicated with a dagger ⟨†⟩, attempts to clarify a difficult reading in the main text:

B oc halff tridi eilna haur til ‘yť00-farsta’ ‘fyrsta’ banda (37r8-9)
‘And two and a half ells high to the uppermost [first] band’

’yť00-farsta’ ] yfrsta A 31v2.

It is not possible to determine whether Bilefeld took this defective reading fyrsta ‘first’ for yf(a)rsta ‘uppermost’ from another manuscript (perhaps misreading the token in Codex A), or he provided the correction out of his own interpretation of the text.

15 Found on 1v9, 3r16, 5v20, 7r18, 7v8, 8v12, 10r12, 10v19, 11v2, 12r4, 12r9, 34r1, 34v7, 36r12.
16 Read wensl.
CHAPTER 3. TEXTUAL CRITICISM

Two notes contain more than a single word, though not a full phrase, and should be considered together. Both are found in Chapter 5, which also contains two additions above the line – ⟨vm⟩ 7r18, ⟨than⟩ 7v8 – and one expanded numeral in the margin – ⟨tria⟩ 7v (§3.3.3).

Bilefeld added the first of these two shorter marginal notes to correct the provision regarding what one may transport to market on a holy days. The original reading in B lists the items as follows:

B med garlakom madnadi, ustom oc | smierj, fiskom ella mialk matj, ella | soydum
(7r5-7)

‘with prepared foodstuffs, cheeses and butter, fish or dairy products, or livestock’

Codex A, on the other hand, places ‘fish’ after ‘dairy products’, and includes ‘fowl’.

The readings in G and D correspond with A:

A miþ garlacum maþnaþi. vstu m. oc | smieri. oc allum mielcmati. fiscum. oc | fuglum. eþa soybun (6v3-5)

G myt bereiter spise mit kese n | Potter vnde mit allerleie | milch spyse. vische. vøgele. | adir qwek (3va12-15)

D med redeboen maduare, med ost och smør, oc | med al mielckmat, med fisk och fugle, oc || med smaa boskaaff (7v20-8r1)

Bilefeld adds “fiskum oc fuglum” in the margin, indicating with a caron ⟨‸⟩ that these items should be listed after ‘dairy products’, as in the other codices. With this addition and the correction of “fiskom ella” to “oc allu”, the reading in B is brought closer to A. On the other hand, the final ⟨ella⟩ is changed to ⟨och⟩, where A has ⟨eþa⟩. In this way the new reading in B is closest to the reading found in D:

B med garlakom madnadi, ustom oc | smierj, ‘och allum’ mialk matj, ‘fiskum oc fuglum’ ‘och’ | soydum (7r5-7)

‘with prepared foodstuffs, cheeses and butter and all dairy products, fish and fowl, and livestock’ The second marginal note in chapter 5, found on the following verso, reads “fyri thaim”, where the use of ⟨ai⟩ hints at either Codex A or X as the source. If a corresponding reading in A is to be found, however, it reads “firi þaun” 7r8. It is not clear, however, that the addition in B is meant to be read in the place A has “firi þaun”, as “fyrj | theim” is already found in the main text in B 7v14-15, and the marginal note, which lacks a place marker, appears immediately after subj yrkin ‘they work’:

B ta Byti drotin fyrj | theim iij. ‘tria’ oyra,: en thaim yrkin ‘fyrj thaim’ | tria winter eptir (7v14-16)

‘Then the lord pays 3 [three] øre in compensation for them, and they work [for them] three winters afterwards.’

Þa bytir | drotin firi þaun þria oyra En þaun yr|kin. þria vintr A 7r7-9.
Presumably the addition of ⟨tria⟩ derives from the same source as “fyrj thaim” (§3.3.3). If Codex A is this source, then Bilefeld copied not only ⟨t⟩ and ⟨th⟩ for ⟨þ⟩, but also ⟨y⟩ for ⟨i⟩, while he also misread ⟨þaun⟩ as þaim. All of these scribal practices are possible, thus we cannot rule out A as a potential source.

Five longer marginal additions remain, most of which should be argued not to have derived from Codex A. The most apparent of these completely lacks a corresponding reading in the other codices:

B legbain ella armlegger Bytis at twaim | Markum silffs en sunder | ier slaghit (21v)
‘The lower leg and forearm are compensated with two marks of silver if cut off.’

However, the use of ⟨ai⟩ also speaks against β1470 as the source of this correction. Instead we may with Pipping ([1901], 75) attribute this addition to Codex Χ.

Two notes show significant lexical and phrasal variation, eliminating Codex A as a potential source.

B tha en han | dular, oc | kumber mal | up fyrj sochn (1v)
‘If she refuses, and the case comes before the parish’

In the first example, a younger hand has deleted ⟨sochn⟩ and added ⟨tingnu menn⟩.

A further two only show variation at the orthographic (and perhaps phonological) level, meaning we cannot immediately rule out Codex A as a potential source.

B huerghin i helghis | Brut, vtan thi | at ains at mal|der (9r)
‘Neither for Sabbath-breaking, unless a man’

In the first example, Bilefeld was clearly aware of the provision in Codex A from the first example, as he traced over and corrected much of the first four lines on 8v in A. This would also explain the ⟨e⟩ in ⟨huerghin⟩, which Bilefeld otherwise spells with ⟨a⟩ (§4.3.8), although it leaves unexplained the addition of ⟨n⟩ at the end of the word. In the second example, either A or Χ would explain ⟨iru⟩ and perhaps ⟨iam⟩, though copying...
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⟨thoygin⟩ (the expected form) from Codex A ⟨þaugin⟩ (pro þaugin? §4.3.7) would be striking.

One final note should, however, be argued to derive from Codex A, as it shows the same common error “in nat” for inn at §3.2.1.

B  laus gy{|}ter scal i{|}nat gan|ga (45r)
    laus gy{|}rtr  scal in nat ganga  (A 36v13-14)

‘They shall enter loosely girded.’

Notably, this provides evidence for Bilefeld adding a svarabhakti vowel (§4.2.3) where his exemplar did not.

3.4 Discussion

In the previous chapter I argued that David Bilefeld copied Codex B out of a desire for a personal copy of Guta lag, a valid law code he was meant to uphold as a part of his position on Gotland. It is thus only reasonable to assume Bilefeld would have wanted to copy an updated, current version of the law, a text which was subject to change through the years; this in turn does not settle well with the idea that Codex B retains an older recension of the law than that found in Codex A, a two-hundred-year-old codex at the time Bilefeld copied Codex B, and a century older than Bilefeld’s exemplar β1470.

Codex B indeed preserves many of the older parts of the law not found in the elder codex, some of which are not found in G or D either. Nevertheless, it is not valid to claim the β recension is an older version of the law, as the later additions known from the other recensions are also included in Codex B, and are at times better integrated into the β text than in the other codices. Instead of considering recension β an older version of the law, it is perhaps best to think of it as the most comprehensive or complete version, containing more provisions than are found in any of the other codices, except for the ten extra chapters known only from D.

The position of Codex B within the stemma of Guta lag manuscripts is also not as clear as has previously been argued. Linguistic errors common to the two Old Gutnish codices cannot be used to argue for an affinity between Codices A and B to the exclusion of G and D, as the translated manuscripts do not provide significant readings. Likewise the order of the final fourteen chapters do not speak for a common hypearchetype of Codices A and B, though may of course point to a hypearchetype of these additions, having independently entered the α and β recensions. The tentative grouping AD:BG remains only a suggestion, and may suffer some of the same methodological faults used to argue for the grouping AB:GD.

Bilefeld’s hand elsewhere in the corpus proves that the scribe was well acquainted with other Guta lag manuscripts, though exactly how many is not known. It is at
least the case that marginal additions and notes derive from Codices A, G, and the lost Codex X, though whether this was a single codex or multiple manuscripts is of course impossible to tell. Some of the additions which can reasonably be attributed to Codex A are nevertheless not exact orthographic copies, which provides a clearer picture of Bilefeld’s copying habits for the Old Gutnish language: he may himself have replaced word-initial ⟨u v⟩ with ⟨w⟩, and occasionally written ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩ where his exemplar text had ⟨þ⟩. Such habits of copying must be taken into consideration when analyzing the orthography of Codex B, the subject of the following chapter.
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Chapter 4
Orthography and Phonology

4.1 Consonants
- Stops and Fricatives
- Glides
- Resonants
- Sibilant
- Palatalization
- Epenthesis

4.2 Vowels
- Monophthongs
- Diphthongs and triphthongs
- Breaking
- Weak Vowels
- Svarabhakti

4.3 Variation in Codex B
- Danicisms in Codex B
- Lack of ⟨þ⟩
- ⟨æ⟩ and ⟨ø⟩
- ⟨ei⟩ and ⟨ey⟩ for [ai]
- Doubling of Long Vowels
- ⟨i⟩/⟨n⟩-Confusion
- ⟨i⟩-Umlaut
- Lowering [u̯er] > [u̯ar]
- Lowering [ul] > [ↄl]

4.4 Discussion

One of the most striking features of Codex B is the orthography as compared with the older manuscript. The lack of ⟨þ⟩, the use of ⟨ei⟩ and ⟨ey⟩, and the presence of the foreign graphemes ⟨æ⟩ and ⟨ø⟩ result in a manuscript that in many ways lacks what Peel (2006, 56) might call “the particular quality of Gutnish”. Many features are reminiscent of younger Swedish or Danish manuscripts, such as the frequent use of ⟨w⟩ and the combination ⟨ffu⟩, which give the manuscript the younger flair (“yngre prägel”) expressed by Holmbäck and Wessén (1979b, lxv).

Considering the manuscript is more than two hundred years younger than Codex A, we should expect Codex B to reflect actual linguistic change on the island of Gotland; however, this is often overshadowed by the heavy influence of the scribe, David Bilefeld, and his native language, Danish.

In order to assess the language of Codex B from a phonetic perspective, it is
## 4.1 Consonants

The Old Gutnish consonant inventory (Table 4.1) is similar to that of Old Icelandic (on which see e.g. Noreen 1923, 44) and Old Swedish (cf. Riad 2002b, 902). A series of stops are divided into fortis (voiceless) \([p \ t \ k]\) and infortis (voiced) \([b \ d \ g]\), all of which may be geminated in internal and final position. Three voiceless fricatives \([f \ \beta \ h]\) occur in word-initial position and in voiceless clusters, while three non-phonemic voiced fricatives \([\delta \ y \ \gamma]\) occur following vowels and resonants. Two glides \([u \ i]\) occur prevocally in both word-initial and internal position. Finally, the four resonants \([r \ l \ m \ n]\) and the sibilant \([s]\) occur in all positions, and may be geminated.

### 4.1.1 Stops and Fricatives

#### Labials

- **Stop** \(p(ː) b(ː)\)
  - Fortis /p/ is spelled ⟨p⟩ in all positions, e.g. *gen pl penninga* ⟨penninga⟩ 15v3 ‘money; coin’, *inf drepa* ⟨drepa⟩ 11v17 ‘to kill’, *acc pl horp* ⟨torp⟩ 12r9 ‘village’.
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Geminate /pp/ is written double both internally and word-finally, e.g. 3 sg pres subj tappi (tappi) 36v17 ‘lose’, acc sg tupp (tupp) 36v17 ‘headress’. That OGu. upp prep ‘up’ is frequently spelled with a single ⟨p⟩ is likely due to Danish influence; Bilefeld writes ⟨op⟩ for all six tokens of the Danish cognate op in the later ordinances.

The heavy consonant cluster /ppt/ is reduced to /pt/, spelled ⟨pt⟩ in four tokens: nom sg masc ōkliptr (ocliptr) 49v10, dat pl kliptum (kliptom) 49v14, 57r1, all from OGu. klippa ‘to shear, to clip’, and 3 sg pret slepti (slepti) 50r1 from OGu. sleppa ‘to release’; this same reduction is found in Codex A.

Merger of /ft/ with /pt/, which also occurred in Old Swedish and Old Icelandic (Noreen 1904, 199; 1923, 180), is partially determined by morphology. Stems with /pt/ or /ft/ such as OGu. eptir prep ‘after, following’ and þypti neut ‘stolen goods’ (cf. piaufr masc ‘thief’) are always written with ⟨pt⟩, as well as stems ending in -p followed by a t-suffix, e.g. sup þipt ‘cried’ (inf þapa). Stems ending in -f, on the other hand, retain the fricative before t-suffixes in both codices, spelled ⟨fft⟩ in Codex B: nam sg neut halft ⟨halfft⟩ 31r6 ‘half’, sup laift ⟨leifft⟩ 44r12 ‘left’. The only two exceptions are common to both codices: acc sg aftun ⟨affton⟩ 8v8 ‘evening’ and 3 sg pres giptir (Gifftir) 24r21 ‘marries’.

On the use of ⟨p⟩ in epenthesis, see §4.1.6.

b(ː) Infortis /b/ is only found in initial position and is always spelled ⟨b⟩, e.g. bort ⟨bort⟩ 48r ‘away’, nom sg blōþ ⟨blod⟩ 24v15 ‘blood’. Geminate ⟨bb⟩ is not attested in Guta lag, being in general infrequent in Old Nordic; it is however attested in the runic calendars as dat sg krabba CR 17/6, AGW 10/6 ‘Cancer (Zodiac sign)’.

On the use of ⟨b⟩ in epenthesis, see §4.1.6.

f [β] Word-initial /f/ is always spelled ⟨f⟩, never ⟨ff⟩ as in late Old Danish (see e.g. Skautrup 1944, II, 45, 182-183): inf fara ⟨fara⟩ 7r4 ‘to go’, dat pl frendum ⟨frendom⟩ 28r9 ‘relatives’. Intervocalic /f/ [β] is typically written ⟨ff⟩, as in Danish, e.g. inf hafa (haffua) 2v13 ‘to have’, sup gieft ⟨geffuit⟩ 39r5 ‘given’, though both ⟨ff⟩ and ⟨f⟩ also occur, e.g. 3 pl pres dep skrifas ⟨schriffas⟩ 55r12 ‘are written’, 3 pl pres iefa ⟨iefa⟩ 45r15 ‘doubt’. Two tokens use ⟨u⟩: pres ptc hafandi (hauandi) 15r4 ‘pregnant’ and dat sg skrifan ⟨schriuan⟩ 26v20 ‘script’. The variant spellings ⟨ff⟩ and ⟨ff⟩ never occur in the manuscript, which is in line with Bilefeld’s orthography in the Danish ordinances, where only ⟨ff⟩ occurs.

Following resonants /f/ is likewise spelled ⟨ff⟩, ⟨ff⟩, or ⟨f⟩ (only following r):

1Codex A writes OGu. upp with a double (pp) in all tokens but one, gen sg upp-heldis ⟨wp heldis⟩ 29r5 ‘support’, found as ⟨vp⟩ (heldis) 33v18-34r1 in Codex B. The form occurs in Chapter 36, a later addition to the text (§4.1.7) and points to a younger spelling.

2Codex A (afþun) A 7v17-18 and (Gifftir) A 21v7.

3Intervocalic ⟨u⟩ for /f/ is likewise found in two tokens in Guta lag in Codex A: inf hafa ⟨haua⟩ 6r8 ‘to have’ and pres ptc hafandi ⟨hauandi⟩ 27r14 ‘pregnant’ (not the same token as B).
NOM SG MASC sIELFR ⟨sielffuir⟩ 7r18, ⟨sielffir⟩ 12v15 ‘self’, GEN SG erFIS ⟨Erfis⟩ 33r1 ‘funeral feast’. Seven tokens have ⟨u⟩ instead: NOM SG ARFI ⟨arui⟩ 23r14 ‘heir’, ACC SG FEM halFa ⟨kalua⟩ 23r14 'half', GEN SG kalFa ⟨kalua⟩ 31v19 ‘calf (of the leg)’,

NOM SG MASC sIELFR ⟨sieluer⟩ 3v8, 21v5, ⟨sieluir⟩ 5r11, ⟨sieluur⟩ 16v1 ‘self’.

Word-final /f/ is nearly always written double: 3 SG PRES parF ⟨tarff⟩ 2r14 ‘need’, ACC SG gulf ⟨golff⟩ 18v6 ‘floor’. One token with a single ⟨f⟩ occurs: GEN SG līFS ⟨liif⟩ 1bisr13 ‘body’.

Anteconsonantal /f/ is likewise typically written double: 3 PL PRES eflA (Effla) 39v4 ‘are able’, ACC SG NEUT halF ⟨halfft⟩ 7v10 ‘half’. Single ⟨f⟩ is found in five tokens: 3 SG PRET hatF ⟨hatfdi⟩ 1v4, 3r15 ‘had’, DAT SG hatF ⟨hatfdi⟩ 20v16 ‘head’, 3 SG PRES subj stefnI ⟨stefni⟩ 41v6 ‘summon’ (see also § 4.1.6), GEN SG FEM yfru ⟨yfru⟩ 53v10 ‘later’.

**Dentals**

ₜ(ː) Fortis /t/ is most frequently spelled ⟨t⟩ in anlaut as in GEN SG Æma ⟨ti|ma⟩ 49v17-18 ‘time’, ACC NEUT tū ⟨tu⟩ 23v7 ‘two’. Six tokens are spelled with ⟨th⟩ for word-initial /t/, however: NOM SG ÆIA ⟨Thia⟩ 20v3 ‘toe’, OBL Æma ⟨thima⟩ 3r1, 42r6 ‘time’, ACC PL ÆbIR ⟨thider⟩ 2v6 ‘religious service’, DAT SG trō ⟨thro⟩ 1bisr13 ‘belief’, NOM NEUT tū ⟨thu⟩ 22v5 ‘two’.

Both single /t/ and geminate /tt/ are typically spelled ⟨t⟩, occasionally ⟨th⟩, in word-final position: NOM SG NEUT huat ⟨hwat⟩ 18v8 ‘what(ever)’, ACC SG hyt ⟨hat⟩ 22v19 ‘hat’, ACC SG mat ⟨math⟩ 2r4 ‘food’, NOM SG NEUT datt ⟨dath⟩ 2r14 ‘dead’. Final ⟨tt⟩ is only found in a handful of tokens, representing a true geminate /tt/ in NOM-ACC SG NEUT sitt, sett ⟨sitt⟩ 25v3, (sett) 3 tokens ‘his, her(s), its’. Four tokens of OGu. at conj ‘that’ are spelled ⟨att⟩, which is how Bilefeld frequently writes Da. at, found in 20 tokens in the later ordinances; considering Gu. att, however, these spellings may show secondary lengthening. Meanwhile six tokens of NOM-ACC NEUT sket ‘that, it’ are spelled ⟨thett⟩, identical with Bilefeld’s typical rendering of Da. det as found in 16 tokens in the later ordinances. Two tokens of ACC SG rét ⟨rett⟩ 27v10, 28r3 ‘right’ likely also derive from Bilefeld’s orthography in Danish, being identical with all seven tokens of Da. ret in the later ordinances.

Codex B generally maintains a distinction between single /t/ and geminate /tt/ intervocally. Single /t/ is typically spelled ⟨t⟩, e.g. ûtan ⟨vtan⟩ 53v6 ‘but’, though ⟨th⟩ is found in fourteen tokens: 3 SG PRES subj bc REF ⟨Bythi⟩ 2v1 ‘pay (a fine)’, INF geða ⟨getha⟩ 18r17 ‘to guard’, GEN PL guta ⟨Gutha⟩ 1bisr1 ‘Gotlanders’, 3 SG PRES dep mytis ⟨mythis⟩ 12r11 ‘meets’, INF naita ⟨neytha⟩ 1bisr3 ‘to deny’ (§ 6.2.9), GEN PL nāta ⟨natha⟩ 16r2, 8 ‘nights’, DAT SG rēti ⟨rethi⟩ 3 tokens ‘right’, INF sittia ⟨sithia⟩ 24v2,

---

1The same token is found in the elder codex as ⟨calua⟩ 28r8, the only example of ⟨u⟩ following a resonant in Guta lag.

2On the loss of GEN in this form, see §5.2.2.
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52v3 ‘to sit’, ūtan (vthan) 7r10 ‘but’. Geminate /tt/ is by contrast written with double ⟨tt⟩, e.g. 3 SG PRES DEP hittis ⟨hittis⟩ 47r5 ‘is found’, DAT SG siettungi ⟨siettungi⟩ 19r6 ‘sixth (administrative division)’. Double ⟨tt⟩ is found once for intervocalic single /t/, ACC SG vittor⟨p⟩ (wittord) 25r margin ‘right of substantiation’, and must be considered a scribal slip, perhaps in the manuscript from which this marginal note derives (§ 3.3.1). Single ⟨t⟩ for intervocalic geminate /tt/ is never found.

Following long vowels, *tt (PGmc. *ht) is reduced to single t when part of the stem. Ten Old Gutnish lexemes attest to this development: dōtir fem ‘daughter’ (OIcel. dōttir) < PGmc. *duhtēr, drōtin masc ‘lord’ (OIcel. drōttin) < *druhtinaz, ēt fem ‘family, lineage’ (OIcel. ētt) < *aihtiz, hēta wk vb ‘to risk’ (OIcel. hátta) < *hanhtijang, nāt fem ‘night’ (OIcel. nātt, nōtt) < *nahts, rētr masc ‘right’ (OIcel. *rétr) < *rehtaz, sātr adj ‘agreed; reconciled’ (OIcel. sāttir) < *sabtaz, sētir masc ‘reconciler’ (OIcel. sēttir) < *sabtiţaz, vītr masc ‘creature, wight’ (OIcel. vētr, vēţtr) < *wihtiz. The modern language shows *tt > t is phonetic and not merely orthographic, e.g. Gu. dotar (pl dōitrar) fem ‘daughter’, nat (pl netar) fem ‘night’, and retar adj ‘right, straight’. Codex A writes all of these lexemes with a single ⟨t⟩ except for one token DAT SG ēt ⟨ett⟩ A 32v18 (§ 4.3.5). Likewise in Codex B these lexemes are written with a single ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩, with the exception ACC SG ⟨rett⟩ mentioned above, likely a Danicism.

When forming part of the ending tt following a long vowel is permissible, though in Codex B this is written with single ⟨t⟩ in the ptc and sup bȳtt ‘paid’ and ptc NOM SG MASC vīttr ‘charged; proven’. Forms derived from the stem of OGu. aiga PRET-PRES VB ‘to own’, on the other hand, are always written with double ⟨tt⟩ in both codices, e.g. 3 SG PRET ētti ‘owned’ and ētta fem ‘possessions’; these maintain an overlong syllable as they are derivations and not Proto-Germanic stems. OGu. ētta num ‘eight’ and ēttundi num ‘eighth’, which are also always found with double ⟨tt⟩ in both codices, do not follow this pattern, and may be early loans from the fastland.

On the cluster [ts], see § 4.1.4.

d(ː) Infortis /d/ is found in anlaut and following the resonants l m n, always spelled ⟨d⟩: NOM SG NEUT diaupt ⟨diaupt⟩ 19r1 ‘deep’, INF halda ⟨halda⟩ 1bisr8 ‘to maintain’, NOM SG FEM skemd ⟨skemd⟩ ‘shamed’, NOM SG bōndi ⟨bondi⟩ 51r9 ‘farmer’. Geminate /dd/ is found in a single token PTC ACC SG FEM raidda ⟨reydda⟩ 2v13 ‘paid’, spelled ⟨reida⟩ A 3v16 in the elder codex. The grapheme ⟨d⟩ is further found in epenthetic insertion (§ 4.1.6) and for word-internal /p/ (§ 4.3.2).

6 In Codex A only one token of būta is written with a double ⟨tt⟩: PTC NOM SG MASC ⟨byttr⟩ A 20v8.

7 One token (atundi) 25r13, which contains a single, plump ⟨t⟩, appears to have originally been written with a double ⟨tt⟩; cf. Pipping (1901) 32 fn. 2.

8 Note also the variation in the modern forms Gu. attā /atːæ/ and atā /aːtæ/, pointing to a loan.
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þ [ð] Word-initial /þ/ is written ⟨t⟩, though often ⟨th⟩ in function words: acc sg þiauf ⟨tiauff⟩ 47r13 ‘thief’, acc sg masc þinn ⟨thin⟩ 43r11 ‘thy’.

The voiced allophone [ð] is typically spelled ⟨d⟩ or ⟨dh⟩ in internal and final position, e.g. nom sg mabðr ⟨mader⟩ 2v15, ⟨madher⟩ 3v19 ‘man’. Use of ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩ in this position is the exception rather than the rule, occurring in a few tokens, e.g. nom sg lýþi ⟨lyti⟩ 21v5 ‘hearing’, nom sg def garþip ⟨garthinnr⟩ 25r margin ‘the farm’. Following fricative ⟨g⟩ or ⟨f⟩ only ⟨d⟩ is found: 3 sg pret hafþi ⟨hafdi⟩ 3r15 ‘had’, ptc nom sg masc segþr ⟨segdør⟩ 28r3 ‘said’.

In general the grapheme ⟨þ⟩ is missing from Codex B, being found only twice in marginalia; this prominent feature of the orthography is discussed in §4.3.2.

Velars

k(ː) Fortis /k/ is spelled ⟨k⟩, ⟨c⟩, ⟨ch⟩, ⟨ck⟩, or ⟨q⟩. Word-initially ⟨k⟩ dominates, e.g. inf kuma ⟨kuma⟩ 9v2 ‘to come’, although the cluster /ku̯/ is always rendered with ⟨q⟩: gen pl quinma ⟨qwinna⟩ 18r13 ‘women’, 3 sg pret quām ⟨quam⟩ 47v18 ‘came’. Four tokens use ⟨c⟩ in word-initial position: dat sg kristindómi ⟨cristindome⟩ 1²⁸r8 ‘Christianity’, dat pl kristnum ⟨chrisnom⟩ 4v2 ‘Christian’, nom sg kasna-vargr ⟨casnawarger⟩ 48r19, 48v2 ‘arsonist’. The use of ⟨c⟩ in Latin loanwords is known elsewhere in Old Nordic (cf. Diderichsen (1931-1937, xli) for Old Danish) and may also explain the Old Gutnish examples based on kristin ‘Christian’, spelled with ⟨c⟩ in 2/4 tokens; OGu. biskuþpr ‘bishop’, another Latin loan, is rendered with ⟨c⟩ in all 3 tokens. The inherited OGu. kasna-vargr ‘arsonist’, in contrast, is spelled with ⟨c⟩ in both tokens. As a legal term, kasna-vargr may have been interpreted as having the same status as Latin ecclesiastical and legal vocabulary, explaining the use of ⟨c⟩.

The cluster sk is most frequently spelled ⟨sch⟩, e.g. 3 sg pres skal ⟨schal⟩ 19v17 ‘shall’, nom sg gutniskr ⟨gutnisher⟩ 13r11 ‘Gotlandic’, though both ⟨sk⟩ and ⟨sc⟩ also occur, e.g. skal ⟨scal⟩ 1²⁸r16, gutniskr ⟨gutnisher⟩ 14v14. Geminante ⟨k⟩ is almost always spelled ⟨ck⟩ or ⟨kk⟩, e.g. acc sg bukk ⟨buck⟩ 50r10 ‘buck’, 3 sg pres þykkir ⟨tykkir⟩ 9r12 ‘seems’; twice, however, we find single ⟨k⟩ in auslaut for OGu. stukkr masc ‘stock, post’: acc sg ⟨stuk⟩ 28r7, ⟨stok⟩ 44v2.

Non-geminante /k/ is often spelled ⟨ck⟩ in OGu. sik refl pron (8 tokens) and following resonants, e.g. nom sg kyrkiþ ⟨kirckia⟩ 3r7 ‘church’, dat sg fulki ⟨folcki⟩ 57v3 ‘folk, people’, 3 sg pres dep skenkis ⟨schenckis⟩ 32v15 ‘is poured’. Pip-ping (1905-07, lxvii) considers this evidence of a true gemination, noting a similar lengthening of ⟨k⟩ after resonants in Finland Swedish; however, there is no evidence to support this within modern Gotlandic pronunciation. Furthermore, the use of

[Holmbäck and Wessén (1979a, 51 note 50) connect the first member of OSw. kasnavargarher with kasi (Sw. kase) masc ‘stack, pile; heap of tinder (for burning)’, while the second member is common Germanic for ‘outlaw, scoundrel’.]
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⟨ck⟩ following resonants is common in early Danish orthography, and certainly a feature of Bilefeld’s orthographic practice. Only one token of single ⟨k⟩ is found following a resonant in the later Danish ordinances, Da. hvilken (Huilkken) G 34r2 ‘which(ever)’; elsewhere in the ordinances resonants are always followed by ⟨ck⟩. Similarly, ⟨ch⟩ is found for /k/ in four tokens of OGu.

Similarly, ⟨ch⟩ is found for /k/ in four tokens of OGu. sik as well as following resonants, though only before the dental consonants t and n, where ⟨ck⟩ is never found: 3 pl pres drunkna (drunchna) 26v1 ‘drown’, ptc Nom sg Masc merkt (merchter) 16v17 ‘marked; clipped (of the ear)’. In the Danish ordinances we find one token of Da. merkt (merckt) G 40r7 ‘marked’ and no tokens with ⟨cht⟩, perhaps suggesting Bilefeld did not follow this practice, though we should not place too much weight on this single token.

Lenition of k > g in the endings -likr, -lika is evident in three tokens in Codex B: laglika (lagliga) 37r10 ‘lawfully’, õskellika (o scheliga) 35v12 ‘unlawfully’, Nom sg Neut pekkilik (tokkelighit) 1⁴st-r12 ‘favored, pleasing’.[10] Elsewhere /k/ is preserved in e.g. sínlikr adj ‘visible’ and in the related ending in OGu. huilkin pron ‘whichever’ (Gu. vikken, vakken with assimilation of lk; cf. pg. 215 fn. 27 and Gustavson 1948, 169). Whether the tokens with ⟨g⟩ truly show Gutnish lenition or are merely Danicisms is unclear; Gustavson (1948, 152) note the ending -likr is still found with k in Neogard’s word-list from 1732 (Wollin 2009, 216) in fattik, fatiker adj ‘poor’ (Gu. fattir, fattin with regular loss of *g).

Infinitive /g/ is always spelled ⟨g⟩ in initial position, e.g. Inf nga (ganga) 2r5 ‘to go; to walk’. Intervocalic /g/ [γ] is most frequently spelled ⟨g⟩ as in Acc pl daga (daga) 8v6 ‘days’, 3 pl pres aiga (eyga) 3r5 ‘have to’, though is spelled ⟨gh⟩ in roughly one out of six tokens, e.g. daga (dagha) 6v2, aiga (eygha) 3r5. Post-vocalic /g/ [γ] is spelled ⟨g⟩ and ⟨gh⟩ with equal frequency in word-final position: Acc sg dag (dag) 7v6, (dagha) 1⁴st-r10 ‘day’. A similar pattern is found in Codex A, although word-final ⟨gh⟩ is less frequent in the elder manuscript.

Following liquids /g/ is spelled ⟨gh⟩ in only a handful of tokens in either manuscript. The sequence ⟨rg⟩ occurs only twice in Codex B, Dat sg torgi (torgi) 7r7-8 ‘market square’ and huergin (huerghin) 9r margin ‘neither’ (§6.3.5); the same tokens are strikingly also found with ⟨rg⟩ in Codex A, Dat sg (torgi) A 6v5 and (huerghi) A 8v3, and the elder manuscript has one further token, Nom sg burgan (Burgan) 42v15 ‘credit’, spelled (Burgan) 54r15 in Codex B. The sequence ⟨gh⟩ occurs slightly more frequently, appearing in seven tokens in Codex B, six of which are OGu. helg fem ‘peace, surety’ and the seventh Acc sg helgis brut ⟨helghis | Brut⟩ 9r margin ‘Sabbath-breaking’; the five tokens in Codex A are similarly all OGu. helg fem ‘peace, surety’, helgis brut neut ‘Sabbath-breaking’, or helgr adj ‘holy’.

10 An exception is Da. punkter ‘points’, spelled ⟨puncter⟩ in all three tokens, an example of ⟨c⟩ for /k/ in Latin loans (cf. Diderichsen 1931-1937, xli).
11 Codex A ⟨laglica⟩ A 31r7, ⟨o sche|llica⟩ A 30r4-5. For the final token the elder codex instead reads Nom sg dyřf (dyṛf) A 2r13 ‘honor’ (§6.2.2).
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The use of ⟨g⟩ following nasal ⟨n⟩ shows a marked difference between the codices, as the elder manuscript never has ⟨ngh⟩, while in Codex B the sequence appears in 33 tokens, e.g. nom sg masc engin (enghin) 1v10 ‘no one’, acc sg þing (tingh) 50r17 ‘assembly’, 3 pl pres ganga (Gangha) 2r7 ‘go’. This practice is in line with Bilefeld’s Danish orthography; in the later ordinances we find e.g. ⟨konningh⟩ G 33r3 ‘king’, ⟨tinge⟩ G 40r13 ‘assemblies’, etc.

Geminate /gg/ is typically written double, e.g. inf leggia ⟨leggia⟩ 2r8 ‘to lay’, 3 sg pres baggr ⟨haggar⟩ 54v5 ‘chops’, although word-final /gg/ is found with a single ⟨g⟩ in acc sg þagg ⟨hagg⟩ 5 tokens ‘blow’, acc sg þegg ⟨egg⟩ 31v7 ‘leg’ and in the compound nom sg þeggþain ⟨legbain⟩ 21v margin ‘shinbone’, and with ⟨gh⟩ in nom sg þegg ⟨Skegh⟩ 22v10 ‘beard’. The heavy cluster /ggþ/ is reduced in ptc dat sg neut þyggþu ⟨bygdu⟩ 1r9 ‘inhabited’, though this reduction is already evident in Codex A. The cluster /gh/ is always spelled ⟨gd⟩, e.g. segþr ⟨segd⟩ 28r3 ‘said’, while gt is spelled ⟨ght⟩ or ⟨cht⟩, e.g. segt ⟨secht⟩ 37r10 ‘said’, suggesting a pronunciation [xt] (as in Modern Icelandic; Kristján Arnason 2011, 165ff.).

The voiceless fricative /h/ only occurs in word-initial position, as PGmc. *h was lost in North Germanic before the literary period (cf. Wessen 1965, 38; Haugen 1976, 155). Initial *h is furthermore lost before the resonants r l n in Old Gutnish (Noreen 1904, 241), though remains before the semivowels i u. Codex B always writes initial /h/ without exception, even before the semivowels, e.g. inf þafa ⟨haffua⟩ 2v13 ‘to have’, dat sg uppheldi ⟨vpheldi⟩ 25r16 ‘support’, nom sg þial ⟨hial⟩ 38v11 ‘wheel; well cover’, hwaski ⟨hwaski⟩ 4r15 ‘neither’. In Codex A we find two tokens where /h/ is missing, dat sg þafreki ⟨afreki⟩ A 39v5 ‘shipwreck’ and acc sg þumla ⟨umbla⟩ A 5r1 ‘hop (grain)’, as well as two examples of reverse spellings, acc sg þagsverk ⟨dags huerk⟩ A 40v2 ‘day labor’ and þā en ⟨þa hen⟩ A 3r8 ‘when’ (Söderberg 1879, 36). Otherwise the elder codex is consistent in its use of ⟨h⟩; these misspellings, most of which can be explained otherwise, are best considered slips.

4.1.2 Glides

The labial glide /u ı/ is frequently written with ⟨w⟩ in word-initial position and in initial consonant clusters, e.g. 3 sg pres wil ⟨will⟩ 2r5 ‘wants’, dat sg suerþi

12Initial h is eventually lost in this position as well (Gustavson 1948, 188).
13The token ⟨afreki⟩ immediately follows af prep ‘of, concerning’, while ⟨þa hen⟩ is followed by hann tron ‘he’; both could thus be due to dittography. The ⟨h⟩ in ⟨dags huerk⟩ has been deleted by the main scribe via subunction (Pipping 1905-07, 57 fn. 6), leaving only (umbla) unexplained. Curiously, this form is found in the doublet boy ð humbli “hay or hop”, for which we should not expect the alliteration to be lost on the scribe. Söderberg (1879, 36) gives one possible example of intrusive ⟨h⟩ in Guta saga, acc (hetningar) A 48v12 for either hetningar or etningar fem pl ‘contentions, hostilities’, which Bugge (1877-1878, 263-264) connects with OIcel. etja str vb ‘to contend; to egg on’. 
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⟨swerdi⟩ 20r15 'sword', ACC SG HUIF ⟨hwiff⟩ 31r9 'headcovering', ACC SG Fem ÞUERA ⟨twera⟩ 19v11 '(a)cross'; Codex B shares this orthographic feature with Guta saga (Pipping [1905-07], lxxvii).

Only two exceptions are found in absolute initial position: SUP VEGIT ⟨vegit⟩ 20r16 'lift' and Nom SG VIGNIAURI ⟨vigniauri⟩ 21r4 'testicle'. As the second member of a compound we find DAT SG MASC SUÆ-VERÞARI ⟨sueverdari⟩ 17r5 'lesser' and ACC SG LIT-VÅN ⟨lituan⟩ 19v6, 10 'facial blemish, scar'. Following initial s only two exceptions are found, SUÆ-VERÞARI (sueverdar) 23v16-17 (used adverbially) and 3 SG PRES SUBJ SUERI ⟨sueri⟩ 48v10 'swear'; ACC SG VEG-ÞUERA 'roadblock' is found three times with ⟨u⟩, being the only exceptions following (original) P; no exceptions are found following (original) t.

The combination ⟨hu⟩ is found with some frequency, e.g. HUASKI ⟨huaski⟩ 10v18 'neither', NOM SG Fem HUILIK ⟨huilich⟩ 51r17 'whichever', though ⟨hw⟩ dominates. The cluster /ku/ is most frequently spelled ⟨qw⟩, e.g. GEN PL QVINNA ⟨qwinna⟩ 26r16 ‘women’, and also in word-internal position in e.g. Nom SG MASC NAQUAR ⟨naqwar⟩ 27v4 ‘someone’, although ⟨q⟩ is found once in Nom Pl QVINDIS MENN ⟨qvindis men⟩ 40r1 ‘women, females’; ⟨qu⟩ is found in 17 tokens, e.g. Nom SG MASC NAQUAR ⟨naqwar⟩ 14v5 ‘someone’.

Bilefeld’s rendering of the glide /u/ is completely in line with his orthography in Danish. In the ordinances in G we find word-initial ⟨w⟩ everywhere except for three tokens of (vidtne) G 36v16, 38r10, 11-12 ‘witness’, one token (vidnisbyrd) G 42v12 ‘testimony’, and one token (vidtagen) G 39r22 ‘adopted’. Likewise in initial clusters the spellings ⟨hw⟩, ⟨sw⟩, and ⟨qw⟩ dominate (tu- is not found).

Stem-final /u/ is completely lost in the Proto-Norse sequences *ggw, *ngw, *nkw in Codex B: PTC Nom SG Neut HAGGIT ⟨haggit⟩ 21v17 ‘chopped, hewn’, 3 SG Pres Dep SINGS ⟨singsis⟩ 32r13 ‘is sung’, 3 PL PRES STINKA ⟨stinka⟩ 31v5 ‘leap up’ (cf. Olcel. hoggva, syngva or syngja, støkkva). In Codex A /u/ is still preserved in the participle forms of OGu. HAGGA STR VB ‘to chop, to hew’ – Nom SG Fem HAGGUI (haggin) A 19v14 and Neut HAGGUIT (hagguit) A 18v17 – though is lost in the INF HAGGA (hagga) A 25r1, 29v16-17 and 3 SG PRES SUBJ HAGGI ⟨haggi⟩ A 31v13. The elder codex also preserves the glide in OGu. STINQUA STR VB ‘to leap up’, found in four tokens of 3 PL PRES STINQUA (stinqua); all four tokens in Codex B, on the other hand, are spelled ⟨stinka⟩. Considering both codices consistently spell /k/ as ⟨q⟩ before /u/, it is safe to assume other manuscripts of Guta lag favored this spelling as well, including Bilefeld’s exemplar. That Bilefeld writes ⟨stinka⟩ rather than ⟨stinqua⟩ strongly suggests this spelling derives from the exemplar manuscript, and that it indicates an actual phonetic loss of /u/ rather than a mere loss of ⟨u⟩ due to scribal

14 Loss of /u/ is known in the participle in Old Icelandic, where Masc HOGGVINN and HOGGINN (also -o-) both occur, though the Inf HOGGVA always preserves the glide. Old Swedish, on the other hand, has lost /u/ everywhere: Inf HUGGA, HOGGA, PTC HUGGIN, HOGGIN (cf. Noreen [1904], 445).
error, as a copy error ⟨qu⟩ > ⟨k⟩ is unlikely.

\[\text{i} \]
The palatal glide /\text{i} ̯/ \[j\] is always written ⟨i⟩, being indistinguishable from the vowel /i/: PTC NOM SG NEUT ietit ⟨ietit⟩ 47v3 ‘eaten’, NOM SG biaul ⟨biaul⟩ 38v11 ‘wheel; well cover’, INF spyria ⟨spyria⟩ 45r15 ‘to ask’, INF leggia ⟨leggia⟩ 2r15 ‘to lay’. Note that underlying *\[i\] ̯* disappears before the front vowel i, as in Icelandic (cf. Noreen 1923, 218), thus INF leggia ⟨leggia⟩ 2r8 ‘to lay’, 3 SG PRES leggir ⟨leggir⟩ 2r20 (OICel. leggja, leggir).

4.1.3 Resonants

Liquids

r(ː) The rhotic is written ⟨r⟩ in all positions, e.g. NOM SG rauferi ⟨Rauferi⟩ 48r19 ‘robber’, INF krefia ⟨krefuia⟩ 17r12 ‘to demand’, DAT SG āri ⟨ari⟩ 39r16 ‘year’, ADV hier ⟨Hier⟩ 1⁶bis1 ‘here’. Final /-r/ following a consonant is often written with an er-abbreviation above ⟨r⟩, e.g. ACC SG sigr ⟨sigher⟩ 1⁸bisr7 ‘victory’; cf. §4.2.3. Geminate /rr/ is written double in internal position, e.g. ACC SG MASC quarran ⟨qwarran⟩ 44r12 ‘remaining’, ADV fyrra ⟨fyrра⟩ 28r3 ‘before’, while word-final ⟨rr⟩ never occurs. Occasionally, non-geminate /r/ is written double word-internally, e.g. INF biera ⟨bierra⟩ 6r3 ‘to carry’.

l(ː) The lateral is written ⟨l⟩ in all positions, e.g. INF laupa ⟨laupa⟩ 3v2 ‘to run’, GEN SG kletis ⟨kletis⟩ 16v14 ‘shed’, INF DEP alas ⟨Alas⟩ 1⁶bisr16 ‘to be nourished’, NOM SG māl ⟨maal⟩ 1⁶bisv17 ‘case’. Geminate /ll/ is written double in internal position, e.g. ella ⟨ella⟩ 7v22 ‘or’, 3 PL PRES DEP fullas ⟨fullas⟩ 45r18 ‘are filled’. No distinction is made between (etymologically) geminate /ll/ and single /l/ in word-final position: PREP til ⟨til⟩ 12r20, ⟨till⟩ 12v17 ‘to, until’, NOM SG prēl ⟨trel⟩ 23v15, ⟨trell⟩ 23v9 ‘slave’ (cf. OICel. prēll). Pipping (1905-07, lxxxvii) considers the doubling of ⟨l⟩ in forms such as ⟨till⟩ to indicate a phonetic lengthening as in Sw. till (cf. [Noreen] 1904, 233). However, this tendency of doubling final -l is completely in line with Bilefeld’s orthography in Danish; in the ordinances in G he spells Da. til with a single ⟨l⟩ in 13 tokens, double ⟨ll⟩ in 17. Other examples of doubled final -l in the ordinances include ⟨marckeskell⟩ G 34r9 ‘boundary’, ⟨skall⟩ 14 tokens ‘shall’, ⟨maall⟩ G 3418 ‘matters’.

15 A single token of final ⟨rr⟩ is found in Codex A, ACC SG bār ⟨barr⟩ A 19r7 ‘hair’, clearly a scribal slip as the etymon does not contain a geminate. The lack of final -rr in both manuscripts suggests a reduction of *-rʀ* > -r, though this may instead be purely orthographic, in line with Old Swedish practice (see Wessen 1963, 41 fn. 21, 52).

16 The modern language does not distinguish the so-called “thick l” (Sw. “tjockt l”) or retroflex flap (Gustavson 1948, 153), nor is there evidence for two l phonemes in Old Gutnish. The dotted l-rune found in ACC SG kialera G 163, which Zetterholm (1939, 22) argues indicates a dental l, stands for a long (geminate) ll (Jansson et al. 1978, 68).
4.1. CONSONANTS

Nasals

\(m(ː)\) Word-initial and internal /m/ are always spelled \(m\), e.g. ACC SG mungat (mungat) 22r10 'drink, feast ale', DAT SG smieri (smierj) 7r6 'butter', 3 SG PRES kumbr (kumber) 9r16 'comes', GEN SG tīma (thima) 3r1 'time'. Word-final /m/ is typically spelled \(m\), e.g. sum (som) 4v2 'that, which, who', 1 PL PRES skulum (schulum) 1r3 'shall', though is abbreviated in nine tokens: DAT SG MASC allum (allum) 7r16 'all', DAT SG MASC andrum (androm) 56v10 'other', DAT SG MASC hānum (hanom) 8r2 'him', DAT SG MASC buarium (hwarium) 2r2 'each', DAT PL MASC mannum (mannom) 48v11 'men', DAT PL sakum (sakum) 1bisv11 'case', DAT SG MASC sinum (sinum) 4v1, PL (sinum) 39r5 'his, hers, its', DAT PL þaim (thaim) 7v margin 'them'.

Geminate /mm/ is only found in OGu. frammar ADV 'further' and frammarla ADV 'as long as', and is spelled ⟨mm⟩ in all but a single token, which is abbreviated ⟨fra

On the confusion of ⟨im⟩ with ⟨un⟩ in OGu. þaun fem sg or neut pl 'it; they', see §4.3.4.

\(n(ː) [\text{n}]\) Initial /n/ is always spelled with ⟨n⟩, e.g. nū (nw) 4v18 'now', DAT SG nefa (neffua) 9v18 'fist'; ⟨n⟩ also dominates for internal and final /n/, e.g. ACC PL kunur (kunur) 1bisr19 'women', NOM SG sun (son) 11v19 'son'. The allophone [ŋ], which occurs before the velars g and k, is likewise spelled ⟨n⟩, e.g. DAT SG þingi (tingi) 41v16 'assembly', 3 SG PRES DEP skenkis (schenkis) 32v15 'is poured'.

Geminate /nn/ is kept distinct from single /n/ word-externally, being spelled double, e.g. DAT PL mannum (mannom) 3r1 'men', 3 SG PRES kennir (kennir) 29r2 'acknowledges'. A single token 3 SG PRES kennir (kennir) 30v7 'acknowledges' must be taken as a slip, perhaps influenced by the preceding NOM SG kuna (kuna) 30v7 'woman'. Twice viunta STR VB 'to do; to be able' is misspelled as 3 PL PRES (witna) 4v9, 39r16, which may be due to the verb viunta wk VB 'to bear witness'. Final geminate /nn/ is not typically kept distinct, being spelled with single ⟨n⟩ in most tokens, e.g. NOM SG DEF sunimm (sonin) 24v1 'the son', NOM PL memm (men) 21r5. Geminate spelling is only found in two tokens, ACC PL memm (men) 1bisv margin 'men' (§3.3.5) and the erroneous ⟨thinn⟩ 4r4 for DAT SG þaim 'that, the'. This is in stark contrast to Codex A, where geminate [nn] is typically indicated in monosyllables, e.g. NOM SG haff (han) A 5r14 'he', NOM PL memm (men) A 7r6 'men'. In the Danish ordinances in G we only find a single example of final ⟨nn⟩, ⟨handrann⟩ G 37r18 'petty theft'; otherwise Bilefeld follows the typical Danish practice of writing single ⟨n⟩ word-finally or ⟨nd⟩ in e.g. ⟨mand⟩ 'man', ⟨hand⟩ 'he' (cf. Skautrup[1944]).

---

17This token is a scribal error which should rather be ACC SG sak; Codex A (sac) A 2v10.
18Codex A (suninn) A 21v8. Note that Gu. -en MASC, -i FEM shows Old Gutnish preserved a distinction between geminate -m and non-geminate -n in the definite article.
19Exceptions do occur, especially in the pronouns, e.g. NOM SG MASC þann (þan) 5r5 'that, the', though also in nouns, e.g. NOM PL memm (men) 4r14 'men'.
Occasional spellings of ⟨nd⟩ for /nn/ in Codex B, e.g. NOM SG hann ⟨hand⟩ 33v17 'he' or NOM PL menn ⟨mend⟩ 9v7 'men', are taken to be Danicisms (§ 4.3.1).

A nasal stroke for 'n' is only found in ten tokens. Three are word-final /n/, one of which occurs in a geminate: 3 PL PRES SUBJ sȳmin ⟨symin⟩ 2r10 'restore (one’s honor)', NOM SG MASC hinn ⟨hinn⟩ 23v12 'the other', ACC SG MASC annan ⟨annan⟩ 30r3 'another'. Word-internally, geminate /nn/ is abbreviated six times: DAT SG mammi ⟨mami⟩ 2r3, 23r18 'man', GEN PL mamma ⟨mamma⟩ 3v15, 11r19 'men', NOM SG laigu leinningr ⟨leygu lemingher⟩ 3r8 'tenant', ACC SG sunnudag ⟨sonnudagh⟩ 6v6 'Sunday'. Once [ŋ] is abbreviated: GEN SG kaupungs ⟨kaupungs⟩ 7r3 'marketplace'; otherwise non-geminate /n/ is never abbreviated word-internally.

4.1.4 Sibilant

The sibilant /s/ is spelled with ⟨s⟩ in all positions, e.g. 3 SG PRES sitr ⟨Siter⟩ 40r16 'sits', INF sȳsla ⟨sysla⟩ 1b1r10 'to perform, to execute', GEN SG gutnisks ⟨Gutnischs⟩ 15r19 'Gotlandic'. Geminate /ss/ occurs in a few words, spelled with double ⟨ss⟩ in word-internal position, e.g. NOM SG messa ⟨messa⟩ 32r13 'mass', GEN PL tassala ⟨tassala⟩ 33r11 'tassel', DAT SG NEUT þessu ⟨thesso⟩ 53v13 'this'. Final geminate /ss/ is typically spelled with single ⟨s⟩, e.g. NOM SG russ ⟨Rus⟩ 17r20, though one token ACC SG ⟨russ⟩ 7r20 occurs as well. The tokens GEN SG hunds ⟨Hwnss⟩ 17v13 'dog' and NOM SG bús-froya ⟨hussfroya⟩ 44v5 'housewife' are further anomalies.

The cluster /ts/ is spelled ⟨z⟩ in ten tokens, three of which are GEN SG -s following a stem ending in a dental: ACC SG allsvaldugan ⟨Alzwaldugan⟩ 1b1r5 'all-powerful', GEN SG guþs ⟨gudtz⟩ 6v7 'God', GEN SG mans ⟨manz⟩ 23v6 'man'. In Codex A these lemmas are always written with ⟨z⟩ for final -s20 whereas in Codex B this spelling is the exception rather than the rule: GEN SG mans is spelled ⟨mans⟩ in 47 tokens, plus a single token ⟨mands⟩ 38r19, a clear Danicism (§ 4.3.1). Bilefeld does not show a clear preference for either spelling in the Danish ordinances, where we find Da. mands in 8 tokens with ⟨z⟩ alongside 3 tokens with ⟨s⟩; guþs is spelled with ⟨z⟩ in both tokens, while Gullands 'Gotland' is found in 4 tokens with ⟨z⟩ alongside a single token with ⟨s⟩. However, Bilefeld never writes ⟨z⟩ immediately following ⟨n⟩ or ⟨l⟩ in the Danish ordinances; it is therefore likely the anomalous spellings ⟨nz⟩ and ⟨lz⟩, were copied from the exemplar manuscript.

The remaining seven tokens with ⟨z⟩ are all found in substantives formed with roots ending in *r plus the deverbal suffix *-isla/*-islón: OBL gêzlu ⟨gezlu⟩ 5 tokens 'care, custody' (OICel. gésla FEM from gêta WK VB 'to tend, to take care of'), ACC PL haitzl ⟨heyzl⟩ 4r19 'invocation' (cf. OICel. heita STR VB 'to invoke', § 5.2.1), NOM SG vēnzl ⟨werzl⟩ 4v7 'suspicion' (cf. OICel. vënta, vëtta WK VB 'to expect, to hope for;
to suspect’).\textsuperscript{121} The final lexeme is also found with ⟨s⟩ as nom sg ⟨wesl⟩ 16v13,\textsuperscript{22} meanwhile, all other substantives of this type are spelled with ⟨s⟩: acc sg baizl ⟨beisl⟩ 23r20 ‘bridle’ (Olcel. beizl neut from beita wk vb ‘to yoke to’), dat sg brigzl ⟨brigsł⟩ 43r9 ‘dispute’ (Olcel. brigzel neut ‘blame; shame’ from bregda str vb ‘to blame’), gen sg vaizlur ⟨weislur⟩ 32v13 ‘reception’ (Olcel. veizla fem from veita wk vb ‘to grant’). In Codex A these substantives are all spelled with ⟨z⟩ with a single exception dat pl brigzulum ⟨brigslum⟩ 1rb16 in the table of contents, which derives from a different (younger) source than the main text (§ 3.1).

The consonant cluster /ks/ is always spelled ⟨x⟩ in OGu. axl masc ‘axle’, kexi neut ‘boathook’, siex(tān) num ‘six(teen)’, uxi masc ‘ox’, yx fem ‘axe’; these lexemes are all exclusively written with ⟨x⟩ in the elder codex as well.

OGu. axl fem ‘shoulder’ is once with ⟨x⟩ in both codices – gen sg axlar ⟨axlar⟩ A 28r5, B 31v15 – and once with ⟨cs⟩ – acc pl axlar ⟨acsłar⟩ A 20r17, B 23r1. In the same vein, OGu. ávaxtr masc ‘growth; interest’ is found twice in chapter 43, spelled with ⟨gs⟩ in both codices in both tokens. These anomalies common to the two Gutnish codices seem to point to a common source. In the latter case, this same use of ⟨gs⟩ is found in the Danish translation “aff vogst” D 42v16, 43r12, pointing to the same origin.

4.1.5 Palatalization

A palatal on-glide appears before the front vowel e generally after word-initial g, occasionally after word-initial k, and rarely after word-initial sk. The resulting sequence, spelled ⟨ie⟩ in the manuscripts, is indistinguishable in writing from the outcome of breaking, e.g. giera vb ‘to do’, with palatal insertion, vs. biera vb ‘to carry’, with breaking. It is thus impossible to say whether ⟨ie⟩ in e.g. giefa vb ‘to give’ < PGmc. *gebani- is the result of palatal insertion or breaking.

gie-

The use of ⟨gie⟩ and ⟨ge⟩ is not consistent in either codex, though they agree in a surprising number of tokens.

Palatalization is indicated in both codices for OGu. giera wk vb ‘to do’ and its derivatives gierþ fem ‘construction; action’, gierþa wk vb ‘to enclose, to fence in’,

\textsuperscript{121}Hald (1975, 56-58) discusses three possible etymologies for this lexeme, settling on a connection with OsSw. vënda til wk vb ‘to accuse someone due to suspicion’, itself a conflation of vëna (Olcel. vëna) wk vb ‘to suspect, to accuse’ and a substantive corresponding to Olcel. vënd fem ‘expectance’. Curiously missing from Hald’s discussion is OsSw. vënta wk vb ‘to believe; to expect’ (Sw. vända ‘to wait, to expect’), Olcel. vënta, vënta ‘id.’, but also ‘to suspect’.

\textsuperscript{22}The lack of v in both tokens must be taken as scribal slips, either by Bilefeld or earlier in the β recension. Pipping (1905-07, 51 fn. 4) attributes the second to a missing nasal stroke, while the first is merely a misreading of ⟨n⟩ as ⟨r⟩.
and **gieþ**i **neut** ‘enclosure, fence’. All tokens in Codex B are spelled with ⟨gie⟩
while in Codex A a few tokens with ⟨ge⟩ are found: **inf** gierþa ⟨gerþa⟩ A 30r13, **ptc**
**nom** **sg** **neut** giert ⟨gert⟩ A 30v18, 31r1. Likewise **giertas** **str dep vb** ‘to please, to
satisfy’ (not found in A; §6.1.4), is palatalized in 3 **sg** **pres** ⟨gies⟩ 42v12.

Neither codex indicates palatalization in **OGu**. **giesemi** **neut** ‘jewel’, attested
once as **dat** **pl** giersemum ⟨gersemu⟩ A 40r9, ⟨gersemom⟩ B 52v1.

For **OGu**. **gierning** **fem** ‘deed, action’, Codex B abbreviates **dat** **pl** gierningum
⟨gerningom⟩ 1r11 with an **er**-title, thus without explicitly indicating palatalization.
Codex A has an unexpected ⟨ia⟩ in ⟨giarningum⟩ A 2r12, leading **Pipping** (1905-07, xv)
to consider the lemma to properly be **giarning**; Codex B points to a lemma **gierning**,
however, which is the expected form considering **OGu**. **giera** and derivatives. **Un**
expected ⟨ia⟩ is found elsewhere after ⟨g⟩ in Codex A: **inf** ⟨giara⟩ A 6v14 and 3
**pl** **pres** **subj** gieldin ⟨gialdin⟩ A 30r20, 49v1-2 (the second token in **Guta saga**).

Codex B does not typically indicate palatalization in **OGu**. **giefa** **str vb** ‘to give’
or in **OGu**. **gielda** **str vb** ‘to pay (a debt); to be worth; to be valid’ and its derivatives
**gield**, **gieldeti**, both **neut** ‘debt’. Codex A always spells these lexemes with ⟨gie⟩,
with the exception of ⟨gieldin⟩ mentioned above; this token in turn corresponds
with ⟨gield⟩ 36r14, one of the few tokens with ⟨gie⟩ for these lexemes found in
the main text in Codex B. Another token **acc** **sg** ⟨gield⟩ 41r21 may be anticipatory
dittography from the following 3 **sg** **pres** gier ⟨gier⟩ ‘does’, while **nom** **pl** ⟨gield⟩
25r margin does not derive from β1470 (§3.3.1).

In the only token of **OGu**. **gief** **fem** ‘gift’, **acc** **pl** giefar ⟨geffuar⟩ 32r20, Bilefeld
had originally written ⟨gi⟩, having corrected ⟨i⟩ to ⟨e⟩. A similar slip is found in
**inf** gief ⟨geffua⟩ 3r19, a Danicism based on Da. *give* ‘id.’ (§4.3.1).

This use of ⟨ge⟩ for /ge/ is atypical for Bilefeld, who always indicates palatalization
in the Danish ordinances: ⟨gield⟩ G 38v7 ‘fee’, ⟨Gielde⟩ G 37v14 ‘pay’, ⟨gier|ning⟩
37v10-11 and (gierningh) 34v1, 37r9 ‘act, deed’. That **OGu**. **giefa**, **gielda**, and deriva-
tives are spelled with ⟨ge⟩ in Codex B and not ⟨gie⟩ (as in Codex A) must then trace
back to the exemplar manuscript and speaks for foreign influence, though here
Danish is not the only candidate. **Brøndum-Nielsen** (1928-73, II, 196) notes palat-
ization in Danish to have originally been an East Danish phenomenon, having
spread westward from the thirteenth century onward; the eventual loss of palatal-

---

23 **Pipping** (1901, 7) reads a token added above the line on 3r16 as ⟨giora⟩, though I read ⟨giera⟩.
24 **Codex** A typically lacks palatalization in the second member of compounds as well, e.g. **dat** **sg**
**brōa**-gerþ ⟨broa gerþ⟩ A 1vb9 ‘road repair’ and **dat** **sg** **kyrkiu**-gerþ ⟨kir|chiu gerþ⟩ A 4v9-10 ‘church-
building’. Neither compound is found in B, which instead has **dat** **sg** **brōan** ⟨broan⟩ 52r9 ‘road repair’
and a simplex gier ⟨gierd⟩ 3v11. **Pipping** (1905-07, lvi) emphasizes palatal insertion only occurs in
syllables with primary stress, explaining these compound forms in Codex A, as well as **gingerþ** **fem**
a ‘type of tax, collected by the bishop’ found in **Guta saga**.
25 **Pipping** (1903, 39 fn. 4) reads the form underneath as ⟨gieffuar⟩, though there is no indication
of a separate ⟨ie⟩.
26 **Note** ⟨giffue⟩ 41r margin ‘to give’ is Danish and not Gutnish (§3.3.4).
ization in Zealand and the standard language may be due to German influence. In the Old Gutnish material we find the lexemes written without palatalization both have close German cognates, MLG *geven ‘to give’ and *gelden ‘to pay; to be worth; to be valid’, whereas no cognates are found for OGu. *giera, *gierþa, etc.

*Pipping (1905-07, lvi) also considers palatal insertion to have occurred before long ō, e.g. inf ⟨gieta⟩ A 16r5 and 3 sg pres subj ⟨gieti⟩ A 31v5 for presumed *giēta ‘to guard, to watch’ (OIcel. *géta) in the elder codex. The palatal glide is missing, however, from the derived substantive *gēzla ‘care, keeping’ (OIcel. *gázla) in all five tokens, leading *Pipping (1905-07, lvi) to conclude palatalization is not regularly indicated. Codex B also lacks palatal insertion in the inf ⟨getha⟩ 18r17, though shows it in the subj ⟨gieti⟩ 37v13. Resting the assertion that palatal insertion occurred before long ō on the three tokens in Codices A and B is problematic, not least when considering spellings with ⟨gie⟩ for OGu. *gēta ‘to guard’ may have arisen via confusion with OGu. *gieta ‘to guard’ may have arisen via confusion with OGu.

(s)kie-

Palatalization is never indicated after initial k- in Codex B. The elder codex shows a palatal ⟨i⟩ in four tokens only, three of which are forms of the verb *kena wk vb ‘to acknowledge; to know’. It is possible this lack of palatalization derives from Bilefeld’s own orthographic preference; in the Danish ordinances ⟨kende⟩ G 37r1 ‘acknowledge’, ⟨kendis⟩ G 40r16 ‘is acknowledged’, and ⟨ketterie⟩ G 39r4, 5-6 ‘blasphemy’ lack palatalization, though it is found in e.g. ⟨kier⟩ G 33r7 ‘dear’.

Following initial sk-, Codex A indicates palatalization more frequently than Codex B. Though the sample size is small, the distribution in Codex B appears to follow a phonological rule, as palatalization of sk- is never indicated in front of e from original *a via i-umlaut. Thus nom sg skegg ⟨skegh⟩ 22v10 ‘heard’ < PGmc. *skagja-, ptc nom sg masc öskemdr ⟨oschemder⟩ 4 tokens, fem skemd schemd 30r1, 56r16, ⟨schempd⟩ 30r2 ‘(un)ashamed’ < PGmc. *skammijan-, and the suffix -skepr masc < PGmc. *skapi-, found in nom sg fordēþskepr ⟨forden|schep} 48v1-2 ‘witchcraft’ and acc sg lækisskep ⟨leksichep⟩ 19r2 ‘medical care’, all lack indication of palatalized sk-.

In front of original (Proto-Germanic) *e, palatalization is indicated, e.g. acc pl forskiel (forschie) 23r10, 14 ‘use of the senses’ < PGmc. *furi-skela-, dat pl skielum (schielum) 5 tokens ‘cause; proof; condition’ < *skela-, 3 pl pres conj dep skierins (scherins) 33v11 ‘be cut’ < *skeran-. The single exception adv öskellica ⟨o scheliga⟩ 35v12 ‘unlawfully’ (rel. skiel neut ‘cause; proof; condition’) may point to a common origin with ⟨o schellica⟩ A 30r4-5, the only example of missing palatalization before PGmc. *e in the elder codex.

27 The copy in C 81, on the other hand, shows palatalization after k.
28 Note the loanwords skē wk vb ‘to happen’ and skenkia wk vb ‘to pour’ < MLG schēn, schenken also lack palatalization.
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This near-perfect distribution of ⟨e⟩ and ⟨ie⟩ suggests initial sk- lost its palatal quality before OGu. e < PGmc. *a at some point in the history of Old Gutnish. That the elder codex shows traces of palatalization, e.g. acc sg ⟨Schieg⟩ A 19v3 and nom sg fem ⟨schiemd⟩ A 26v7, indicates OGu. e < *a and original e maintained a separate quality at least up until the thirteenth century, when Guta lag was first codified, and longer than either Old Swedish [Noreen 1904, 105 dates the merger of OSw. *e and *æ to the tenth century] or Old Danish (pre-literary; Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, I, 302).

4.1.6 Epenthesis

Epenthetic insertion of d after n l and b p after m occurs in both Gutnish codices, though to differing degrees. Both A and B regularly insert an epenthetic consonant before r, while epenthesis after m is more common in Codex B (Pipping 1905-07, lxxxviii).

Before r

The regularity of epenthesis before r in both codices speaks for an early development. That the epenthetic consonant appears in front of svarabhakti vowels (§4.2.5) in both codices indicates epenthesis occurred prior to anaptyxis.

Epenthetic d occurs after n in four lexemes:

- annar pron ‘second, other’ (OICel. annarr): acc sg fem ⟨andra⟩ 4 tokens; dat-gen sg fem ⟨andri⟩ 7r10, 63v19 (§5.2.4); dat sg neut ⟨andru⟩ 4 tokens; dat sg masc and dat pl ⟨androm⟩ 11 tokens; nom pl masc ⟨andri⟩ 3v12, 10r12, ⟨ander⟩ 24r20; nom-acc pl fem ⟨andrar⟩ 3 tokens. – samnr adj ‘proven; true’ (OICel. samnr): nom sg masc ⟨sander⟩ 6 tokens. – tanmr masc ‘tooth’ (OICel. tanmr fem): acc pl ⟨tender⟩ 22r1, 2. – vinna str vb ‘to make, to induce; to be able, to suffice’ (OICel. vinna ‘to work’): 3 sg pres ⟨winder⟩ 10 tokens, ⟨winder⟩ 5r16.

A further three lexemes show epenthetic d after l:

- allr adj ‘all’ (OICel. allr): nom sg masc ⟨alder⟩ 46v1; gen pl ⟨aldræ⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨alldræ⟩ 10r18. – falla str vb ‘fall; fail to provide evidence’ (OICel. falla): 3 sg pres ⟨falder⟩ 28v3, 31r20; dep (falds) 27v14. – skella str vb ‘to sound, to jingle’ (OICel. skjalla): 3 sg pres ⟨schilder⟩ 20r3.

Epenthetic b is found after m in five lexemes:

- hamar masc ‘hammer’ (OICel. hamarr): dat sg ⟨hambri⟩ 5 tokens. – bôrdômr masc ‘adultery’ (OICel. bôrdômr): nom sg ⟨hordomber⟩ 48v1. – kristindômr masc

20On nom sg neut ⟨sand⟩ 41v6, see §4.3.2.
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‘Christianity, Christendom’ (Olcel. kristindómr): nom sg ⟨kristindom⟩[t] 6r19-20. – kuma vb ‘to come’ (Olcel. koma): 3 sg pres ⟨kumber⟩ 15 tokens, ⟨kumbir⟩ 23r2, ⟨komker⟩ (read kumber) 41v14, ⟨kumber⟩ 15 tokens, ⟨kumbir⟩ 1biv6.

The misuse of ⟨k⟩ in ⟨komker⟩ suggests Bilefeld copied from an exemplar with epenthesis, which was already well established in the fourteenth century: Codex A consistently writes all the above lexemes with an epenthetic consonant (with the exception of kristindōmr, which is not found in the NOM SG in Codex A).

Furthermore, epenthesis occurred prior to the insertion of a svarabhakti vowel (§4.2.5), as epenthetic d and b are inserted before e.g. NOM SG MASC -r. This development is already evident in Codex A in three tokens with both epenthetic d and a svarabhakti vowel i: ⟨faldir⟩ A 25r11, ⟨sandir⟩ A 32r10, ⟨vindir⟩ A 27r19. Due to the coalescence of unstressed i and the svarabhakti vowel in Codex B (§4.2.5), NOM SG MASC allr ‘all’ (not found in A) is only kept distinct from PL allir in writing because of epenthetic d.

m-clusters

In addition to mr > mbr, epenthetic insertion after m occurs in front of the dental consonants t l n, though more often in Codex B than in A. Epenthesis of md > **mpd, on the other hand, does not seem to occur, despite the sequence ⟨mpd⟩ being found in a few tokens in the younger codex.

mbl Epenthesis of ml > mbl appears in four lexemes in B:


Only two of the above four lexemes have epenthetic b in Codex A, found in three tokens: acc sg humla ⟨humbla⟩ 5r1 and obl stumla ⟨stumbla⟩ 29r17, 29v13. Neither codex shows epenthesis in the compounds iem-langr adj ‘equally long’ or iem-langi masc ‘the same time in the following year’: acc sg ⟨iemlangan⟩ A 32r3, ⟨iem lagan⟩ B 38r17; obl ⟨iem langa⟩ A 20r6, ⟨iemlanga⟩ 12v19, ⟨iem langa⟩ B 23r6. Codex A further lacks epenthesis in OGu. iem-likà ADV ‘consistently, always’ ⟨iemlica⟩ A 45r3 in Guta saga.

mpt Epenthesis of mt > mpt appears only once in Codex A, in the PTC sent sik ⟨semp sic⟩ 34v18 ‘agreed, decided’, for which five tokens without epenthesis are also found. In B epenthesis is found in the following lexemes:

femtān num ‘fifteen’ (Olcel. fimmtnán): ⟨femptan⟩ 24r8, 27r18. – femti ord ‘fifth’ (Olcel. fimmnti): ⟨fempti⟩ 15v2, 16r3 (both in cmpd ⟨half-femti⟩ num ‘four and a half’), gen sg neut ⟨fempta⟩ 33r9. – semia (sik) wk vb ‘to agree upon; to decide’ (Olcel. semjask): ptc ⟨semp⟩ 6 tokens.
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The token ptc nom sg neut *hemt* (hempt) 14v5 ‘avenged’ likewise shows ⟨mpt⟩; however, epenthesis is found throughout the paradigm of OGu. *hemna* and should instead be attributed to *mn > mpn* (see below).

Conversely, epenthesis is missing from the following tokens:

\[ienn, iamm\] adj and adv ‘even(ly)’ (Olcel. *jafrin*): nom.acc sg neut ⟨iamt⟩ 23v8, ⟨iem⟩ 24r14. – *femtān* num ‘fifteen’ (Olcel. *fimmtān*): ⟨femtan⟩ 34v3. – *semia* (sik) wk vb ‘to agree upon; to decide’ (Olcel. *semjask*): ptc ⟨sem⟩ 52r10, 53v9. – *varmr* adj ‘warm’ (Olcel. *varmr*): acc sg neut ⟨warmt⟩ 21v3.

\[mpn\] Epenthesis before *n* is never found in Codex A, while in Codex B *mn > mpn* is regular (see also Pipping 1905-07, lxxxviii). This rule applies to both original (Proto-Germanic) *mn, e.g. namn neut ‘name’ < PGmc. *namōn-*, as well as *bn, e.g. lifna, limna, which assimilated to *mn in the East Nordic area around 1300 (Noreen 1904, 194; see also Bandle 1973, 57). Both codices contain a few tokens of *fn rather than expected *m(p)n, indicating the older cluster was still present in Old Gutnish around the codification of *Guta lag*.

The following tokens show *mn > mpn:*

\[efni, enmi\] neut pl ‘assets’ (Olcel. *efni*): dat (empnom) 27v9. – *femni neut ‘ability’: dat sg (empn) 20r18, 19. – *hemna wk vb ‘to avenge’ (Olcel. *hefna*): inf ⟨hemna⟩ 6 tokens; 3 sg pres ⟨hemnar⟩ 14v6; subj ⟨hemna⟩ 14v9; sup ⟨hemnat⟩ (read hempnat; Pipping 1905-07, lxxxviii) 5v7; ptc (hempt) 14v5. – *iann, ienn adj and adv ‘even(ly), equal(ly)’ (Olcel. *jafrin*): nom.pl masc ⟨iempni⟩ 15v15. – *kufna, kemna* wk vb ‘to choke, to suffocate’ (Olcel. *kvafna, kafna*): 3 sg pres ⟨kumpnar⟩ 18v11. – *kuma wk vb ‘to come’ (Olcel. *koma*): ptc nom pl fem ⟨kompn⟩ 54v16-17. – *lfina, limna wk vb ‘to remain, to be left’ (Olcel. *linna*): 3 sg pres ⟨limn⟩ 25r15. – *namn neut ‘name’ (Olcel. *nafn*: acc sg (namn) 30r13. – *nemna wk vb ‘to name, to appoint’ (Olcel. *nemna*): inf ⟨nemp⟩ 3v10; 3 pl pres ⟨nemp⟩ 5v14; 3 sg pres subj ⟨nemp⟩ 45r8. – *nēr-kumin adj ‘closely related’ (Olcel. *nær-komin* ‘entitled to’): superl nom sg masc ⟨ner kump⟩ 15r10-11. – *stefna, stemna wk vb ‘to summon’ and fem ‘meeting’ (Olcel. *stefna*): inf ⟨stemp⟩ 48v6; obl sg ⟨stemp⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨stemp⟩ 42v6; nom pl ⟨stem⟩ 42r4. – *syfni, symni neut ‘sexual intercourse’ (Olcel. *svfni*): gen sg ⟨symn⟩ 30r3.

Codex A preserves the older *fn-forms in 3 sg pres kufnar* (cufnar) A 16v1 and in 4/7 tokens of OGu. *stefna* (both substantival and verbal). The latter is found once in Codex B as 3 sg pres subj *stefni* (stefn) 41v6.

Final -*n* is lost in monosyllabic forms of OGu. *iamn, ienn* prior to epenthesis, seen in *iem* (jem) 14 tokens. Meanwhile, epenthesis is not found in the neut forms *ienn* or in compounds with *iem-*, discussed above.

No examples of *mn without epenthesis are found in Codex B. However, the token ⟨runnin⟩ 19v18, which should read *rimnin* (ptc of *rimna, rifna* vb ‘to rip, to
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-crack’) indicates the confusion of minims in this form predates mn > mpn, as we should otherwise expect rimpnin.

**mpd** The sequence ⟨mpd⟩, which Noreen (1904, 260) considers irregular for Old Swedish, is found in three tokens in Codex B.

*bebd* fem ‘revenge’ (OIcel. *befnd*): nom sg ⟨hempd⟩ 14v8; dat pl ⟨hempdum⟩ 11r17. – *skemma* vb ‘to shame’ (OIcel. *skemma*): ptc nom sg fem ⟨schempd⟩ 30r2.

Of these three tokens, the first two may instead be examples of mn > mpn, considering this substantive is an *-ipō derivation of the verb *hennna, henna*. This does not help to explain ⟨schempd⟩ from *skemmdr* (from the otherwise unattested verb *skemma*). Of the seven tokens of *skemmdr* in Codex B, only one contains ⟨p⟩, thus ruling out a regular development md > mpd. Meanwhile, retained md is found in another token: ⟨symdar⟩ 1bis v14. Instead of indicating a phonological development, the ⟨p⟩ in ⟨schempd⟩ is likely due to ditography from the following line, where the token ⟨symnis⟩ 30r3 shows expected mn > mpn, thus indicating md > mpd did not occur in Old Gutnish.

Relative chronology

The two Old Gutnish codices clearly show epenthesis was not a single occurrence, but rather a set of independent changes, for which we may posit the following relative chronology:

1. *nr > ndr, lr > ldr, mr > mbr*. Evident in all tokens in both codices, epenthesis in front of *r* must have been completed by the middle of the fourteenth century.

2. *ml > mbl*. Insertion of *b* had begun before the copying of Codex A, evident in the lexemes *humi* and *stumi*, though Codex B shows a more complete development.

3. *mt > mpt*. Found only in *samt sik* in Codex A, and sporadically in B, this form of epenthesis does not seem to have been fully completed in Old Gutnish. It is furthermore lacking in the modern language.

4. *mn > mpn*. The final form of epenthesis by end of the fifteenth century, before the copying of β1470.

4.2 Vowels
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The vowel inventory of Old Gutnish (Figure 4.1) is smaller than that of any other Old Nordic language, in part due to the merger of the umlaut vowels *ø, *y and *æ, *e. The inventory of monophthongs consists of six short vowels [a e i o u y] and six long counterparts [aː eː iː oː uː yː]; in addition is the mid-front rounded vowel [ø], found only in loanwords. The diphthongs [ai au oy] and triphthong [iau] are characteristic of Old Gutnish. Only the short monophthongs [a i u] can occur in unstressed position.

4.2.1 Monophthongs

a(ː) Short /a/ is spelled ⟨a⟩ in both stressed and unstressed position, e.g. nom sg malr ⟨madr⟩ 2v13 ‘man’, 2 sg pres sargr ⟨sargr⟩ ‘wound’. In Codex B /a/ from earlier /e/ is found in the sequence /u ̯ar/, e.g. inf vara ⟨wara⟩ 9r12 ‘to be’ (from older vera; § 4.3.8), and in the pron naquar ‘somebody’ (older nequar; § 5.1.4). Unstressed /a/ from earlier /e/ occurs in OGu. at conj ‘that’ (§ 4.2.4). Archaic broken *e > ia is preserved in a few forms in Codex B (§ 4.2.3).

Long /aː/ is written either single or double, e.g. acc pl ār ⟨ar⟩ 49v5, ⟨aar⟩ 50r8 ‘year’ (§ 4.3.5).

e(ː) Short /e/ is written ⟨e⟩ in stressed position, e.g. 3 sg pres bellir ⟨bellir⟩ 13r15 ‘is able’. Weakly stressed e occurs as a variant of i before geminates in e.g. dat sg fem senni (senni) 12v7, sinni (sinni) 8v1 ‘his, her(s), its’. Bilefeld also occasionally uses ⟨e⟩ for i in unstressed syllables (§ 4.2.4) and to indicate the svarabhakti vowel (§ 4.2.5).

Long /eː/ is typically spelled single, e.g. acc sg fē ⟨fe⟩ 2r1 ‘money, payment’. Double ⟨ee⟩ occurs in OGu. ēt fem ‘family, lineage’ and hrēl masc ‘slave’ (§ 4.3.5).

i(ː) Short /i/ is spelled ⟨i⟩ in both stressed and unstressed positions, e.g. 3 sg pres dep singis (singhis) 32r13 ‘is sung’, word-finally the orthographic variant ⟨j⟩ also occurs, e.g. dat sg fem sinni (sinni) 8v1 ‘his, her(s), its’. Bilefeld also occasionally uses ⟨e⟩ for i in unstressed syllables (§ 4.2.4) and to indicate the svarabhakti vowel (§ 4.2.5).

Long /iː/ is likewise spelled ⟨i⟩, e.g. nom sg thi ⟨Thi⟩ 20v3 ‘toe’, though can also be doubled as ⟨ii⟩ or ⟨y⟩, e.g. dat sīr (siir) 3r14 ‘him(self), her(self)’, nom sg fem skir (skyr) 1v11 ‘clean; innocent’. Due to Bilefeld’s practice of writing a dotted ⟨y⟩, it is not always possible to distinguish ⟨y⟩ from ⟨ii⟩ in the manuscript (cf. § 2.1.1).

o(ː) Short /o/ originally only occurred before r + consonant and in the unstressed conjunction ok ‘and’ and prefix for-, though by the time of Codex B the lowering of u > o before l + (non-dental) consonant had also occurred (§ 4.3.9). It is spelled ⟨o⟩ in all of these positions: 3 sg pres orkar ⟨orkar⟩ 54r17 ‘is able’, ok ⟨och⟩
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Bilefeld frequently employs ⟨o⟩ to indicate weak /u/ (§ 4.2.4).

Long /oː/ is spelled either single or double, e.g. ACC SG hōr ⟨hor⟩ 29v1, ⟨hoor⟩ 29r19 ‘adultery’.

u(,) Short /u/ is spelled ⟨u⟩ in stressed position, e.g. ACC SG tupp ⟨tupp⟩ ‘headress’, DAT PL ustum ⟨ustom⟩ 7r4 ‘cheeses’. Word-initially /u/ is almost exclusively spelled ⟨v⟩, e.g. undir ⟨vndir⟩ 37v12 ‘under, beneath’, though word-initial /u/ primarily occurs in prepositions, adverbs, and prefixes such as OGu. um PREP ‘about’, undan ADV ‘away’, uf- ‘too (much)’, thus relatively unstressed. On the use of ⟨y⟩ for expected ⟨u⟩, see § 4.3.7. The use of ⟨o⟩ for expected ⟨u⟩ occurs in weak syllables (§ 4.2.4) and in root syllables via Danish influence (§ 4.3.1).

Long /uː/ is spelled ⟨u⟩ or ⟨w⟩, e.g. NOM PL hūs ⟨hws⟩ 4r7, ACC ⟨hus⟩ 10v10 ‘house’.

y(ː) Both long and short /y(ː)/ are spelled ⟨y⟩, being never doubled: DAT SG syni ⟨synj⟩ 25v14 ‘son’, 3 SG PRES SUBJ bỳti ⟨Byti⟩ 39v7 ‘pay a fine’.

ø The front mid rounded vowel /ø/ occurs only in loanwords and is always long in Modern Gutnish (Gustavson 1972-1986, xi). In Guta lag we only find the phoneme in OGu. sl masc ‘beer’, høgol NEUT ‘support’, and høgsla WK VB ‘to give support’. Two tokens are written with ⟨ø⟩ in Codex B, NOM SG øl ⟨øøl⟩ 32v9 and 3 SG PRES SUBJ høgsli ⟨høgsli⟩ 27v15, on which see § 4.3.3. Elsewhere we find these lexemes spelled with ⟨o⟩ or ⟨oo⟩, e.g. GEN SG øls ⟨ools⟩ 32v13, INF høgsla ⟨hogsla⟩ 29r19 (§ 4.3.3).

4.2.2 Diphthongs and triphthong

ai The diphthong /ai/ is usually spelled ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩, e.g. INF laifa ⟨leiffua⟩ 34v3, ⟨leyffua⟩ 4r2 ‘to leave behind’. The spelling ⟨ai⟩ occurs, though is limited in its distribution (§ 4.3.4). OGu. al ADV ‘not’ is always spelled ⟨ey⟩, which is also how Bilefeld renders Da. ej in the Danish ordinances. Slips occur where Bilefeld writes ⟨ie⟩ instead of ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩ in forms which have a close Danish cognate (§ 4.3.1), e.g. prefix baim- ⟨hiem⟩ 13r8 ‘home’ (Da. hjem), DAT PL gaitum ⟨gietom⟩ 50r7 ‘goats’ (Da. ged, older giet).

au The diphthong /au/ is usually spelled ⟨au⟩, never ⟨av⟩ or ⟨aw⟩: ACC PL augun ⟨augon⟩ 22r10 ‘eyes’. Occasional variation occurs with /oy/ (§ 4.3.7).

In OGu. haun FEM SG or NEUT PL ‘it; they’ the diphthong is erroneously rendered as ⟨ai⟩ (§ 4.3.4).

oy The diphthong /oy/ is spelled ⟨oy⟩, e.g. 3 PL PRET SUBJ hoyrhin ⟨hoyrdin⟩ 28r20 ‘heard’, though occasional variation with /au/ occurs (§ 4.3.7).

30 An exception DAT SG ⟨gulffi⟩ 16v9 is discussed in § 4.3.3.
The characteristic triphthong /iau/ is typically spelled ⟨iau⟩, e.g. Inf biaupa ⟨Biauda⟩ 14r12 ‘to offer’. In a few exceptions Bilefeld instead writes ⟨iu⟩: Acc sg neut diaupt ⟨diupt⟩ 18v17 ‘deep’, 3 sg pres liautr ⟨liutir⟩ 25v12 ‘receives’, 2 sg pres skiautr ⟨skiuter⟩ 9v19 ‘shoot’. Pipping (1905-07, xcii) considers these three tokens to be Swecisms (cf. Sw. ljus ‘light’ vs. Da. lys ‘id.’), however, these should instead be considered Danicisms, as early Danish orthography also had ⟨iu⟩. Bilefeld himself writes ⟨spiud⟩ G 37v12 for Da. spyd ‘spear’. Furthermore, in two more tokens of OGu. liauta ‘to inherit; to receive’ Bilefeld has corrected an original ⟨iu⟩ to ⟨iau⟩ (5r17, 5v19), showing he had a tendency for writing ⟨iu⟩ where his exemplar presumably had ⟨iau⟩.

### 4.2.3 Breaking

Breaking of short *e* originally produced *ia* in Old Gutnish, having later undergone progressive umlaut to *ie*, though variation still exists (cf. Gustavson 1940, 1, 243-255; Snædal 2002, 202-204 and references). This older form appears in a few tokens in both Gutnish codices of Guta lag, though never in the same tokens. In A the spelling ⟨ia⟩ is mostly found after word-initial g: Dat pl gierningum ⟨gia–rningum⟩ 2r12 ‘actions, deeds’; Inf giera ⟨giara⟩ 16v14 ‘to do’; 3 pl pres subj gieldin ⟨gialdin⟩ 30r20 ‘pay’. Alongside these tokens we find the defective 3 sg pres hielpar ⟨ chíalþar⟩ 2r7 ‘helps’ (see §3.2.2).

Tokens with ⟨ia⟩ are more common in Codex B, though still less frequent than ⟨ie⟩, appearing in only nineteen tokens:

- **iek** pron ‘I’: 4/4 tokens.
- **iemn** adj and adv ‘even(ly)’: 8/25 tokens.
- **mielk** fem ‘milk’: 2/3 tokens.
- **sielfr** adj ‘self’?: 2/42 tokens.
- **siex(tān)** num ‘six(teen)’: 3/4 tokens.

Progressive umlaut of *ia* > *ie* in Danish occurred as early as the twelfth century and became generalized in the fourteenth (Hansen 1971, 13ff.), making influence from Danish implausible for the tokens with ⟨ia⟩ in Codex B. These tokens must rather represent archaisms in the text.

---

31 A possible exception is OGu. fiarþi ord num ‘fourth’ and the derived substantive fiarþungr masc ‘one-fourth’, which are always found with ⟨ia⟩ in both codices. The consistency and relative frequency of these tokens (10 in A and 11 in B) speak for a lexically defined fiarþi rather than expected **fierþi** with progressive umlaut, perhaps under the influence of OGu. fiarþir num ‘four’, neut fiugur. Gu. fjårde and variants must then be influence from the mainland.

32 All four tokens are found in Chapter 4 and are missing from Codex A (§3.1.1).
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4.2.4 Weak Vowels

The three-series of weak vowels a i u are always spelled as such in grammatical endings in Codex A, whereas in Codex B the high vowels i and u vary with their mid-vowel counterparts e and o, at least orthographically. This variation appears at the surface level reminiscent of vowel harmony and/or vowel balance, or of general reduction of unstressed vowels. The latter may indeed be convincing, considering the reduction in the modern language of OGu. a, i > [ɛ] and u > [ɔ] in grammatical endings (cf. Gustavson 1948, 1ff.). The data, however, speaks more for orthographic influence from the Bilefeld’s native language.

a in grammatical endings

There is no evidence for vowel harmony, vowel balance, or raising of a > e in Codex B. Unstressed a is always written with ⟨a⟩ in the younger codex, as in the elder, with the exception of ACC SG ⟨fundar laun⟩ 47r15, a slip for expected fundarlaun (§6.1.5).

i in grammatical endings

Word-final i is most frequently written with ⟨i j⟩ in Codex B, although ⟨e⟩ does occur in e.g. DAT SG landi ⟨lande⟩ 1bsr16 ‘land’. The total number of occurrences is low, however, and most forms also have tokens spelled with ⟨i j⟩, e.g. ⟨landj⟩ 1bsr9. Despite this variation, Pipping (1905-07, xci) argues the tokens with ⟨e⟩ follow a pattern, positing two phonetic environments for a lowering of unstressed i > e:

1. Following heavy syllables with a e o in the root, e.g. DAT SG landi > lande ‘land’, DAT SG henni > henne ‘her’, DAT SG fulki > folke ‘folk, people’.

2. In words of three or more syllables, e.g. COMP dyrari > dyrare ‘more expensive’; in proclitics, e.g. fyri- > fore- (on which see §6.2.1); and in hiatus, e.g. 3 SG PRES SUBJ flği > flye ‘flee’.

Pipping admits not all tokens of final ⟨e⟩ fit neatly into his phonetically-defined system, excusing 3 SG PRES SUBJ dragi ⟨drage⟩ 13r6 ‘pull’ as proclitic, 3 SG PRES SUBJ biaubi ⟨biaude⟩ 13r14 ‘offer’ as containing a in the root (the only example with ⟨iau⟩), and DAT SG hüsii ⟨huse⟩ 26r20 ‘house’ as a true exception.

Notably only two lexemes show a significant number of tokens with word-final ⟨e⟩, namely DAT SG henni ‘she’ and NOM-ACC NEUT and CONJ båpi ‘both’; of
these, only *henni* is exclusively written with ⟨e⟩. Either form can easily be taken as a Danicism of relatively frequent close cognates, *hende* and *både* (§4.3.1). Other tokens with final ⟨e⟩ are few and, in most lexemes, final ⟨i⟩ outnumbers final ⟨e⟩ (Table 4.2). This infrequent use of ⟨e⟩ for final ⟨i⟩ is then demonstrably an orthographic variant, having no phonetic significance.

The use of ⟨i e⟩ and the *er*-tittle for the ending *‑ir* is discussed in §4.2.5.

Unstressed ⟨i⟩ otherwise occurs before the dental consonants ⟨n s t⟩ in various grammatical endings, e.g. past participles, 3 PL SUBJ, DEP, and the definite article. In Codex B these endings appear written with ⟨i⟩ without exception. Preservation of ⟨i⟩ before dentals is known from Danish, especially before *s* and *t* (Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, I, 417), which is also Bilefeld’s tendency in the Danish ordinances in G, e.g. GEN ⟨Denmarcki⟩ G 33r2 ‘Denmark’ and DEF ⟨hwsit⟩ G 38r9 ‘the house’. On the other hand, Bilefeld tends to write ⟨e⟩ before final ⟨n⟩ in the ordinances, e.g. PTC ⟨beskreffuen⟩ G 33r10 ‘described’, thus ruling out his orthographic tendencies in Danish to explain the consistent use of ⟨in⟩ in Codex B. Instead, this tendency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>⟨e⟩</th>
<th>⟨i⟩</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>henni</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEUT</td>
<td>bāþi</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONJ</td>
<td>bāþi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ADV</td>
<td>ekki</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>dragi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>fflýi</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>barni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>biauþi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMP</td>
<td>dýrari</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>fulki</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>gieldi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG FEM</td>
<td>himni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>hūsi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>hūsbōndi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM-ACC SG</td>
<td>klēþi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>kristindōmi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>landi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>manni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG FEM</td>
<td>þenni</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>ofurmagi</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG FEM</td>
<td>rēt(r)i</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUBJ</td>
<td>sī(i)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.2: Final ⟨e⟩ in Codex B
must have already been present in the exemplar manuscript.

**u in grammatical endings**

Pipping (1905-07, xci) notes ⟨o⟩ is used profusely (“ymnigt”) for unstressed u in Codex B, though never in marginal notes. This would suggest Bilefeld took the word-final spellings ⟨o or om⟩ from his exemplar manuscript β1470.

Especially common in Codex B is the use of the ending ⟨om⟩, which is completely unknown in Codex A but occurs ten times more frequently than ⟨um⟩ in the younger codex. This frequency of ⟨om⟩ in Codex B is difficult to reconcile with vowel harmony and/or vowel balance, as the ending -um has a tendency to block these developments in Old Danish and Old Swedish (cf. Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, I, 403, 405; Noreen 1904, 132; Wessén 1965, 62).

Otherwise ⟨o⟩ for unstressed u is not as common as Pipping suggests. The ending -ur is spelled ⟨or⟩ in only a handful of lemmas: Nom-Acc Pl kyrkiur ‘church’ 5 tokens, Nom SG Fem and Nom-Acc Pl Neut annur ‘other’ 4 tokens, Nom-Acc Pl kunur ‘woman’ 2 tokens, and in the loanword Acc Pl lexiur in a single token. Of these lemmas, only a single token of kyrkiur and four of kunur are attested with ⟨ur⟩. Neither vowel harmony nor vowel balance can apply to all the forms, especially OGu. kuna with both a short stem and high stem-vowel.

For final u the spelling ⟨o⟩ is somewhat more common, occurring frequently in oblique forms of kyrkia (35 tokens) and kunur (26 tokens), far outweighing tokens with final ⟨u⟩ (found in 7 tokens of kyrkia and none of kunur). The remaining forms with final ⟨o⟩ are given in Table 4.3.

Upon closer inspection of tokens with ⟨o⟩ in unstressed position, a graphemic pattern begins to emerge. The rounded grapheme ⟨o⟩ is most frequently used after ⟨i m n⟩, i.e. graphemes composed of minims. The use of ⟨o⟩ instead of ⟨u⟩ in these tokens reduces the possibility of confusing minims; this also explains the frequent use of the ending ⟨om⟩ instead of ⟨um⟩. In total, word-final ⟨o⟩ occurs in 42 tokens following ⟨i⟩ and 49 following ⟨n⟩, whereas ⟨u⟩ only occurs in 20 tokens following ⟨i⟩ and 12 following ⟨n⟩. Following ⟨m⟩, word-final -u is only found in Obl samu ‘same’, spelled once with ⟨o⟩ and seven times with ⟨u⟩.

A clear example of the role of minims in the distribution of ⟨o⟩ and ⟨u⟩ can be seen in the paradigm of OGu. annur Pron ‘second, other’, for which Nom SG Fem and Nom-Acc Pl Neut annur are always spelled ⟨annor⟩, whereas Dat SG Neut andru is always spelled ⟨andru⟩, four tokens each. That the variation between ⟨u⟩ and ⟨o⟩ can be due to the shape of the surrounding graphemes, rather than represent-

---

35 In the table of contents in A Bilefeld has changed ⟨o soyþum⟩ A 1rb1 to ⟨o soyþom⟩.
36 Not included in this ratio are the relatively unstressed sum Pron and Conj ‘who; like, as’ or um Prep ‘about’. The first is spelled ⟨som⟩ in 313 tokens in B, while the latter is spelled ⟨om⟩ in 11 tokens, ⟨um⟩ in four; cf. § 4.3.1.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>⟨o⟩</th>
<th>⟨u⟩</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>messu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>śīnu</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>aīnu</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>ālū</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>yphnu</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>huario</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>stempnū</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>fullu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN SG</td>
<td>Mariu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>miklu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>óskiptu</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>vāru</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>aigu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRET</td>
<td>bakaþu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRET</td>
<td>beryktαþu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRET</td>
<td>flyttu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG MASC</td>
<td>frembru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRES</td>
<td>i(e)ru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>buāriu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRET</td>
<td>kendu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>kennu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC SG</td>
<td>kerra</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC SG</td>
<td>kristnu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRES</td>
<td>kunnu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT PL NEUT</td>
<td>lifandu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC PL</td>
<td>lutu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN SG FEM</td>
<td>nȳu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OBL</td>
<td>samu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>sīku</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL PRET</td>
<td>vāru</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>viku</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>þessu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>þranglausu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>þríþiu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3: Final ⟨o⟩ in Codex B
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Table 4.4: OGu. *sinn, senn*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>MASC</th>
<th>FEM</th>
<th>NEUT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SG ACC</td>
<td><em>sinn, senn</em></td>
<td><em>sīna</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td><em>śīnum</em></td>
<td><em>sinni, senni</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td><em>śīns</em></td>
<td><em>sīnar, sennir</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL ACC</td>
<td><em>śīna</em></td>
<td><em>śīnar</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>śīnum</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN</td>
<td></td>
<td><em>sīna, senna</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4: OGu. *sinn, senn*

...}

Weakly stressed words

The possessive pronouns *minn* ‘my’, *þinn* ‘thy’, and *sinn* ‘his, her, its’ often show a lowering of (shortened) *i* to *e* before geminates, resulting in synchronous variation in e.g. NOM SG *sinn, senn*, DAT SG FEM *sinni, senni*, etc. (Table 4.4). This variation is present in both Gutnish codices of *Guta lag*, and is best attested in the reflexive *sinn,*[28] where the two codices show a surprising agreement in three-quarters of all tokens. In the seven tokens where the codices differ, however, Codex B shows the high vowel *i* where Codex A has lowered *e*:

ACC SG MASC *sinn* ⟨sin⟩ 3r17, 18, 25r8, 37r7; Codex A *senn* ⟨sen⟩ A 4r18, 31r15, 37r7; Codex A *senn* ⟨sen⟩ A 4r18, 31r15.

ACC SG NEUT *sitt* ⟨sith⟩ 29r1, 38v4; Codex A *sett* ⟨sett⟩ A 25v9, 32r8.

GEN SG FEM *sinnar* ⟨sinnar⟩ 12v13; Codex A *sennir* ⟨sennir⟩ A 11v3 (§5.2.3).

The root vowel of OGu. *þissi* DEM PRON does not derive from long *ī* as in the possessive pronouns, and therefore the lowering to *e* before geminates does not apply. Thus in Codex A *þissi* is found with *i* throughout the paradigm, and the

---

[28] Added above the line by the main scribe.
high vowel is preserved in the modern reflexes Gu. *disse*, *issn* (with loss of initial *h* < *þ*).\(^3\) In Codex B, however, we find one token *dat sg neut þissu* (*thesso*) 53v13 together with two tokens spelled with the *et*-abbreviation ⟨ζ⟩, both *acc sg þitta* (*thetta*) 32v10, 49r2. The abbreviation is otherwise used for *nom-acc sg neut þet* ‘that, it’ in 45 tokens in Codex B, and clearly represents an *e* vowel. The use of ⟨ε⟩ or ⟨ζ⟩ in *þissi* is likely due to Danish influence, and may be from Bilefeld, who writes *dette* (Thetta) G 36v6 and ⟨thesse⟩ G 34v18, 36r11, ⟨disse⟩ 33v13, ⟨thisse⟩ 41r9 in the later ordinances.

OGu. *at*, *et* **conj** ‘that’ occurs most frequently with ⟨a⟩ in Codex B – thus indistinguishable from *at** prep and **inf marker ‘to, against, at’ – though ⟨e⟩ occurs in 35 tokens.\(^4\) In Codex A, by contrast, *et* dominates, occurring more than a hundred times in the elder codex. Of the 35 tokens with ⟨ε⟩ in Codex B, only five are an independent conjunction; the remaining thirty are all part of phrasal conjunctions, which may explain the retention of *et*. Thus we find ⟨ε⟩ in *so et* ‘so that’ (11 tokens), *þau et* ‘although’ (9 tokens), *útan þī at ains et* ‘unless’ (5 tokens), *(fyrir) þī et* ‘because’ (2 tokens), *þar til et* ‘until’ (2 tokens), and *til þess et* ‘until’ (1 token).

OGu. *miþ*, *meþ* **prep** ‘with’ is overwhelmingly spelled with ⟨e⟩ in Codex B – 141 tokens in all – while ⟨mid⟩ occurs in only 11 tokens, plus a single token ⟨mit⟩ 28r10. This broader use of the (presumably) younger form *meþ* aligns with the **Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild**, which has four tokens of *med* alongside one token *mit* StSC 23 (due to German influence?). Codex A, by contrast, has ⟨miþ⟩ in around 85% of all tokens, both in Guta lag and Guta saga. The distribution in Codex B shows no significance; all chapters containing *miþ* also contain *meþ*. The preference for *meþ* in the younger codex is possibly due to Da. *med* (ODa. *mæth*), either from Bilefeld or earlier in the β recension. OGu. *meþ* is furthermore the only form to survive in Modern Gutnish (*med*, *mä*, etc.). The related form OGu. *miþan* **conj** and **adv** ‘while, during’ is only found spelled with ⟨e⟩ in Codex B, despite the exclusive use of ⟨miþan⟩ in the elder codex, found in seven tokens.\(^5\) While this use of ⟨e⟩ for *i* in *miþan* appears to be influence from Da. *meden* (ODa. *msthenn*), the second vowel is always spelled ⟨a⟩ in Codex B: ⟨medan⟩ 8 tokens, ⟨medhan⟩ 8r13. This may suggest Swedish influence (OSw. *meðan*, Sw. *medan*), though this is otherwise absent from Codex B and would be surprising in a single lexeme.

---

\(^3\)Gu. *denne* is a loan, likely from Sw. *denne*, and is found in the **Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild as con themne** StSC 77, **neut Thetta** StSC 80. Weakening of *þ* > *h*, which also occurred in Faroese (*besinn, neut betta*) and Norn (cf. **Barnes** [1984], 362), is attested once in Codex A in the rubric “Hitta þet | sum nylast war takit vm loyski” A 41r17-18 [This is that which was most recently taken concerning bald patches].

\(^4\)The defective reading “til thes att | lysir et tridia dygri” 8v9 [until dawn at (*sic* the third day), which in Codex A reads “a þriþia dygri” A 7v18 [on the third day], is not included in this count.

\(^5\)The contracted form *ē men* ⟨emen⟩ A 32r4 in the elder codex corresponds with non-contracted *ē miþan* ⟨ε medan⟩ 38r18 in Codex B.
Instead, I suggest ⟨medan⟩ indicates a true lowering of $i > e$, possibly under the influence of Danish, though with the preservation of $a$ in the ending.

### 4.2.5 Svarabhakti

Characteristic of Bilefeld’s script is the use of an er-tittle ⟨◌̉⟩ to indicate a prop vowel (expanded as $e$ in the present work) before post-consonantal final -r, e.g. NOM SG mafir ⟨mader⟩ 112 tokens 'man'. The same tittle is found in the traced-over text in Codex A, which led Pipping (1904, 17) to identify the hand as Bilefeld’s (§2.3). Bilefeld uses the same abbreviation for Da. $e$ in three tokens in his copy of the Danish ordinances in G: ⟨eller⟩ G 38r16, 39r14 ‘or’ and ⟨Bryder⟩ G 41r8 ‘breaks’.

Often Bilefeld writes the svarabhakti vowel as ⟨i⟩ or ⟨e⟩ in Codex B instead of with an abbreviation marker, indicating a true front vowel in this position and in line with his use of the tittle in Danish. This articulation corresponds with the modern Gotlandic pronunciation [ar] from OGu. -r, a regular development from an earlier -ir or -er (Gustavson 1948, 71). Similar variation of $r$, $ir$, $er$, as well as $är$ for OGu. -r is found in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, further speaking for a front-vowel articulation in the fifteenth century.

Gustavson (1948, 71) finds a significant distribution of ⟨i⟩ and ⟨e⟩ in Bilefeld’s rendering of the prop vowel, noting:

\[
i \text{forekommer ganska ofta (agripir [46v13] o.d.), ej mindre än 63 gånger, där annan vokal än a föregår, 25 gånger då a föregår (akir [54v7], batir [44v15] etc.); } e \text{ förekommer, då a icke föregår 32 gånger, då a föregår 25 gånger. En viss tendens till vokalharmoni föreligger sålunda i forngutniskan.} \]

\[i \text{ occurs rather often (agripir, etc.), no fewer than 63 times when a vowel other than } a \text{ precedes, 25 times when } a \text{ precedes (akir, batir, etc.); } e \text{ occurs 32 times when } a \text{ does not precede, 25 times when } a \text{ does precede. Thus a certain tendency for vowel harmony exists in Old Gutnish.} \]

This small sample size does not seem to deliver any statistical significance regarding vowel harmony, however, especially considering the relative frequency of $a$ (and $ā$), the most common vowel in Old Gutnish (occurring in nearly one-third of all examples used by Gustavson 1948). Many of the forms are hapaxes, including ţāgrīpr masc ‘stolen goods’ and bātr masc ‘boat’ (otherwise found once in the acc sg bāt). In lexemes with more tokens, including akr ‘acre’, the svarabhakti vowel can be indicated all three ways: ⟨aker⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨Akir⟩ 54v7, ⟨Aker⟩ 3v20.

Table 4.5 shows the general pattern of how Bilefeld renders the svarabhakti vowel in Codex B. Only forms occurring in ten or more tokens in the manuscript are included in the data set, in order to avoid the effects of hapaxes and other low-frequency words. The results speak against any tendency towards vowel harmony;
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Tittle</th>
<th>⟨i⟩</th>
<th>⟨e⟩</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>527</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nom sg</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maþr</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestr</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ō)sakr</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>siefir</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acc pl</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ertaugr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pres sg</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aigr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drepr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gangr</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>faþr</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kumbr</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liautr</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>takr</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>verþr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vindr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>98</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adv</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>heldr</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lengr</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.5: Svarabhakti in Codex B
4.2. VOWELS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tittle</th>
<th>⟨i⟩</th>
<th>⟨e⟩</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>faþir</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM PL</td>
<td>allir</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRES SG</td>
<td>bȳtir</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PREP</td>
<td>eptir</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fyrir</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yfyr</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.6: Orthography of -ir in Codex B

instead, some general tendencies in Bilefeld’s orthography begin to emerge. For example, OGu. viþr PREP ‘by, with’ is only either spelled with ⟨er⟩ (10 tokens) or abbreviated (88 tokens), never ⟨ir⟩. Likewise 2/3 SG PRES takr ‘takes’, which is most frequently abbreviated (30 tokens), is never spelled with ⟨ir⟩, though ⟨er⟩ appears in 3 tokens. The family terms faþir ‘father’, mōþir ‘mother’, brōþir ‘brother’, systir ‘sister’, and dōtir ‘daughter’ never take the ending ⟨er⟩ anywhere in the paradigm, though ⟨ir⟩ and abbreviated forms occur for both -r and -ir.

A consequence of indicating the svarabhakti vowel with ⟨i⟩ or ⟨e⟩ in Codex B is that OGu. -r is indistinguishable from original -ir, spelled ⟨ir⟩ or ⟨er⟩, or abbreviated with the same er-tittle. This orthographic merger occasionally causes confusion of singular and plural forms, e.g. NOM SG soyþr ⟨soydir⟩ 17v9 ‘creature’ next to PL soyþir ⟨soyd e r⟩ 36v12 ‘creatures’. The same confusion occurs in Codex A, though to a lesser extent: Pipping ([1905-07], xxiv-xxvi) counts 36 examples of the svarabhakti indicated with ⟨i⟩ and 16 examples of original -ir spelled ⟨r⟩ in the elder codex.

For some lexemes the only distinguishing feature between original -r and -ir is the use of an epenthetic consonant before -r (§ 4.1.6), e.g. NOM SG MASC allr ⟨alder⟩ 46v1 ‘all’ next to PL allir ⟨aller⟩ 5v4. Otherwise the two endings are in theory indistinguishable. However, Table 4.6 shows the ending -ir is significantly more likely to be indicated with a true vowel ⟨i⟩ than with an er-tittle, which dominates the tokens of the svarabhakti vowel (Table 4.5). The infrequent use of ⟨e⟩ for either ending aligns with Bilefeld’s general use of ⟨i⟩ and ⟨e⟩ for unstressed i in the manuscript (§ 4.2.4).

Bilefeld uses the er-tittle for OGu. feþrni NEUT ‘paternal family; paternal inheritance’ in four tokens, e.g. DAT SG ⟨federni⟩ 15v9, and in three tokens of OGu. mȳþrni NEUT ‘maternal family; maternal inheritance’, e.g. ACC SG ⟨myðerni⟩ 25r8. In a single token each, however, he writes out ⟨e⟩ as a medial syllable, e.g. ACC SG ⟨federni⟩ 26v7 and ACC SG ⟨myðerni⟩ 25v3. In Codex A these lexemes are always spelled without a medial vowel, e.g. DAT SG ⟨feþrni⟩ A 14r9 and ACC SG ⟨myþrni⟩ A 22r13. The use of ⟨e⟩ rather than ⟨i⟩ in Codex B may be due to early Da. faderne
and møderne, side-forms of fædrene and mødrene.

Back vowel anaptyxis

Pipping (1905-07, xxv) notes three examples of ⟨u⟩ for the svarabhakti vowel in Guta saga: nom sg kunungr ⟨kunungur⟩ A 44v3, 45v11 ‘king’ and nom sg masc fielkunnugr ⟨fiel kunungur⟩ A 45r15 ‘skilled in many things’. In Codex B we find ⟨u⟩ used in 3 sg pres brestr ⟨Brestur⟩ 38r4 and nom sg masc sielfr ⟨sieluur⟩ 16v1 ‘self’.

Finally, Codex B has inserted anaptyctic [a] in both tokens of yfrsti superl ‘uppermost’, spelled ⟨yfrsta⟩ A 31v2, 16 in the elder codex. The first token now appears as ⟨y farsta⟩ 37v9, though one or more characters have been deleted between ⟨y⟩ and ⟨f⟩, with ⟨y⟩ possibly having been added later. In the margin Bilefeld has added the alternate reading ⟨yfrsta⟩, which must be a misreading of yfrsta. The second token ⟨yffuarsta⟩ 38r10 clearly shows the svarabhakti vowel. That these forms show true anaptyxis of [a] rather than scribal error is seen in Gu. yvarste or yvaste, although yverste and yveste also occur.

4.3 Variation in Codex B

Having assessed the orthographic tendencies and norms in Codex B in the previous section, we may now turn our attention to various places the younger codex deviates from Codex A either orthographically or phonologically. As it is not always immediately apparent whether a variant is purely orthographic or represents a true phonological distinction, both types of variants are treated together in a single section.

4.3.1 Danicisms in Codex B

Danish influence on the orthography of Codex B is not limited to the representation of individual sounds, such as the use of ⟨ffu⟩ for intervocalic /f/ (§4.1.1), but can also be found at the word level. Considering the manuscript was written by a Danish priest, who copied the text for his own personal use as a reference tool for the legal code (§2.4), it is perhaps unsurprising that we find Bilefeld often uses Danish spellings for the ecclesiastical and legal terminology. Furthermore, Gutnish and Danish are closely related languages, and Bilefeld would have recognized much of the basic vocabulary of Guta lag from his native tongue. Common words are therefore often spelled as in Danish, when a close cognate exists.

Note that nom sg kunungr ‘king’ is spelled without a svarabhakti vowel in 8 tokens in Guta saga. Other tokens of the suffix -kunnugr are not found.
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Yet despite this influence on the orthography, the morphology of these ecclesiastical, legal, and common terms remains decidedly Gutnish rather than Danish.

Ecclesiastical and Legal Language

Among the ecclesiastical vocabulary, we find OGu. biskupr masc ‘bishop’ always spelled with ⟨o⟩, as in Da. biskop: nom sg ⟨bisco|per⟩ 3v5-6, gen sg ⟨Biscops⟩ 10r16, nom pl ⟨biscopar⟩ 6v3. All tokens in Codex A, including 13 in Guta saga, spell the second vowel ⟨u⟩. Whether the use of ⟨o⟩ is purely orthographic or reflects a shift in pronunciation is unclear, however: the modern pronunciation of Gu. biskåp (and the reduced form bisp) indicates influence from the mainland. Considering the Danish influence over the Gotlandic church during this period, it is not unreasonable to assume OGu. biskupr was already pronounced with [ɔ] by the time Codex B (or β1470) was copied.

Similarly, the stem-vowel in OGu. prestr masc ‘priest’ is often spelled ⟨æ⟩, as in Danish: nom sg ⟨præst e⟩ 5r19, 9r5, ⟨præster⟩ 4v6, ⟨præstir⟩ 7v11 9r15, 9v15. Roughly one-third of all tokens are written with ⟨æ⟩ due to the influence of Da. præst. These tokens further constitute half of all examples of ⟨æ⟩ in Codex B (§4.3.3), speaking for specifically orthographic influence from the Danish equivalent. Another third (10 tokens) are written with ⟨e⟩ as in Codex A, while the remaining third (11 tokens) are abbreviated. The compound prest-garþr masc ‘parsonage, vicarage’ is written with a connecting vowel in Codex B — dat sg ⟨præsta gardi⟩ 12r5, ⟨præstegardi⟩ 9r8 — whereas no such connecting vowel is found in Codex A: dat sg ⟨prest garþi⟩ 8v10-11, 10v18. Influence from Da. præstegård explains the forms found in B, which may be phonological; in the modern language this compound occurs both with and without a connecting vowel: Gu. prästagard, prästgard.

The weekday name OGu. summadagr masc ‘Sunday’ is rendered as disyllabic in two tokens: acc sg ⟨søndag⟩ 7v15, 53v18. Although the vowel ⟨o⟩ is unexpected considering Da. søndag, the form søndag (more commonly sundag and sunday) is known from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and may reflect Bilefeld’s pronunciation.44 MLG søndag likewise remains a possible source of influence. The stem-vowel is also spelled ⟨o⟩ in two trisyllabic forms — acc sg ⟨sønnudagh⟩ 6v6 and ⟨sonnodagh⟩ 6v11 — while expected ⟨u⟩ is found once in acc pl ⟨sunnodagha⟩ 2v19. Gu. sundag shows the stem vowel u prevailed; this is furthermore the only form found in the runic corpus (including the runic calendars).45

---

43 This token contains an extra abbreviation mark over the ⟨p⟩.
44 Da. søndag is not found in Bilefeld’s copy of the later ordinances.
45 Of the weekday names only summadagr and friadagr ‘Friday’ are attested in the Old Gutnish manuscripts, the latter being found only once in Codex B and spelled as expected: acc sg ⟨fri dagh⟩ 54r4. Elsewhere in the corpus we find dat sg laugadagi lauhadahi CR 16:2 ‘Saturday’ and acc sg Torsdag (var. Torsdag) StSC 72 ‘Thursday’, though the latter is indistinguishable from Sw., Da. torsdag.
The West Germanic loanwords *sial* fem (Da. *sjæl*, older *sjel*) and *þianista* fem ‘service’ (Da. *tjeneste*) are both found spelled with ⟨ie⟩ as in Danish: oblique singular *síel* 1br3, gen singular *síelstu* 6r10. The latter is also found once with ⟨ia⟩, as in Codex A, in the dat singular *þianistu* (tianistu) 6v8, ⟨þianistu⟩ A 6r5.

Danish influence within the semantic fields of church and state is not limited to loanwords, but can also be found among the inherited vocabulary. The precious metals *gull* masc ‘gold’ and *silfr* masc ‘silver’ are occasionally spelled as in Danish: gen singular *gulds* 3 tokens (cf. Da. *guld*), *sylffs* 10 tokens (cf. early Da. *sylv, sylver*).

No tokens of Da. *guld* are found in Bilefeld’s copy of the later ordinances, though his use of ⟨ø⟩ in all six tokens of gen singular *sølffs* in the ordinances indicates Bilefeld derived the spelling ⟨sylffs⟩ from his exemplar manuscript. Nine tokens of OGu. *silfr* are spelled with ⟨i⟩, as in Codex A, and although ⟨y⟩ is occasionally used to represent long *i* in the younger codex (§4.3.5), the vowel in *silfr* is short. Instead, ⟨y⟩ must indicate a rounded vowel due to Danish influence, which survives in the modern language as Gu. *sylvar*, a variant of *silvar* < *silfr*.

Both the substantive and adjective OGu. *rētr* masc ‘right’ and adj ‘true’ are found with double ⟨tt⟩ in Codex B, in a total of four tokens: nominative singular ⟨rett⟩ 53v17; accusative singular ⟨rett⟩ 28r3, 27v10; accusative singular feminine ⟨rette⟩ 1br9. The remaining tokens are all spelled with single ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩, as are all tokens in Codex A, indicating the simplification of geminate *tt* (from PGmc. *ht*) > *t* following long vowels (see §4.1.1). The tokens with double ⟨tt⟩ are influenced by Bilefeld’s orthographic norm in Danish: all tokens of Da. *ret* (both substantive and adjectival) and *rette* wk vb ‘to correct’ are spelled with double ⟨tt⟩ in the later ordinances. Finally, OGu. *þriþiungr* masc ‘third; riding (administrative region)’ (Da. *treding*) is found twice with the stem-vowel spelled ⟨e⟩, as in Danish: accusative singular ⟨trediungh⟩ 9v13, ⟨trediung⟩ 17r8. All 15 other tokens use ⟨i⟩.

### Common Vocabulary

In addition to the legal and ecclesiastical vocabulary, we find a high prevalence of Danicisms among the basic vocabulary.

Nonce spellings are found in basic verbs such as OGu. *lesa* wk vb ‘to read’, whose only token plural present dependent *lesas* 54r6 contains one of the few examples of ⟨æ⟩ and is clearly taken from Da. *læse* (§4.3.3). A single token participial nominative plural masculine *taknir* (taghnir) 9v6 from OGu. *taka* str vb ‘to take’ may likewise be influenced by Da. *tage*, participle plural *tagne*, though ⟨gh⟩ may also have arisen via ditography from the preceding word, accusative singular *lag* (lagh) 9v6 ‘law’. Finally, two tokens of 3 singular present *ier* from OGu. *vera, vara* vb ‘to be’ are spelled as in Danish: 1st singular 5r13, 47v3. The first token

---

46 Found in Old Gutnish exclusively in the compound *guþs þianista* ‘religious service’ (Da. *guds-tjeneste*).

47 For gen (§5.2.2).
is immediately followed by the correct form ⟨ier⟩ r13, though there are no signs Bilefeld attempted to delete or correct the Danish token. The second is preceded by PTC NOM SG NEUT ietit ⟨ietit⟩ 47v3 ‘eaten’, the only attestation of OGu. ieta in the corpus (§6.1.5), the lack of ⟨i⟩ in ⟨er⟩ may be due to haplography from this form. As with the first token, there are no signs of correction on 47v3.

Other nonce spellings include the insertion of ⟨dt⟩ in OGu. gutniskr adj ‘Gotlandic’ – GEN SG MASC gutnisks ⟨Gudtnischs⟩ 15v11 – and guþ masc ‘God’ – GEN SG ⟨gudtz⟩ 6v7. This digraph is not uncommon in Danish, and is found in the later ordinances in e.g. ⟨Gud|land⟩ G 41v3-4 ‘Gotland’ and ⟨Gudt|tz⟩ G 33v16 ‘God’.

Other basic lexical items are found with more frequent Danish interference. Three tokens of OGu. baim neut and ADV ‘home’ are spelled ⟨hiem⟩ 13r4, 8, 40r8 (Da. bjem) as the first member of a compound (baimførp neut ‘home village’, baimfylgi neut ‘dowry’). This transposition of ⟨ei⟩ to ⟨ie⟩ is not surprising, though points to an exemplar manuscript which also wrote ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩ for the Old Gutnish diphthong ai (§4.3.4). Everywhere in the main text Bilefeld writes OGu. sun masc ‘son’ with ⟨o⟩ – 11 tokens in all – whereas NOM SG ⟨sun⟩ 41r is found once in a marginal note (§5.3.1), suggesting the spellings with ⟨o⟩ derive from the exemplar manuscript B1470. As with OGu. sumrudagr mentioned above, the use of ⟨o⟩ should be traced to Danish influence, where the forms son, sun, syn, and søn are all known. Forms with the o-vowel are mostly found in Scania, possibly pointing to a Scanian scribe of B1470.

OGu. maþr masc ‘man’ is found spelled with ⟨nd⟩ in seven tokens, clearly due to the influence of Da. mand, PL mend: NOM SG ⟨mand⟩ 41r margin, ACC SG ⟨mand⟩ 8v16, 18, GEN SG (defective) ⟨mand⟩ 15v11, (mands) 38r19, NOM PL ⟨mend⟩ 9v7, 39v6. The NOM SG form in the marginal note on 41r may derive from an original with mandr, a side-form of maþr (via leveling of the stem man- plus epenthetic d before r) found in 40 tokens in Codex A, though otherwise missing from Codex B. The remaining forms are easily attributed to Bilefeld, who always writes Da. mand with ⟨nd⟩ in the later ordinances. Bilefeld may also be responsible for three tokens of OGu. bann masc PRON ‘he’ spelled ⟨hand⟩ 4r1, 33v17, 41r margin (all NOM SG), as he spells Da. han ⟨hand⟩ in the later ordinances in all tokens of the nom.

Danish spellings are especially frequent among grammatical items, such as OGu. ella conj ‘or’, found once as ⟨eller⟩ 9v16 and once ⟨eller⟩ 5r13 following the two spellings of Da. eller in the later ordinances in Bilefeld’s hand. Bilefeld almost exclusively writes OGu. sum conj and PRON ‘which, as’ with ⟨o⟩ – 313 tokens in all – as in Da. som, spelled with ⟨o⟩ in all tokens in the later Danish ordinances. Only

---

48 In the cmpd guþs bianistu fem ‘religious service’, DAT SG ⟨gudtz | tianistu⟩ 6v7-8.
49 Cf. the examples given in Hansen (1962, 35), Brøndum-Nielsen (1928-73, I, 384 and III, 137), and the discussion in Palmér (1931, 146ff.).
50 Codex A (manz) A 14r10.
51 Plus one token ⟨som⟩ 4r18, which has been changed to ⟨saa⟩ for OGu. so ADV ‘so’.
twice does Bilefeld write ⟨sum⟩ 1\textsuperscript{st}v6, 25r margin, the exclusive spelling in Codex A. Similarly OGu. um prep ‘around; about’ is found as ⟨om⟩ in fourteen tokens, aligning with the only spelling of Da. om in the later ordinances, although the vast majority of tokens in Codex B – 80 total – are spelled ⟨um⟩ or ⟨vm⟩ as expected.

Finally, initial þ is occasionally spelled with ⟨d⟩ in grammatical items, as in Danish cognates. OGu. þā adv ‘then’ is spelled ⟨da⟩ in six tokens due to influence from Da. da, while a seventh token on 51r18 contains an original ⟨D⟩ which has been changed to ⟨T⟩. Likewise OGu. þū pron ‘thou’ is found once spelled ⟨du⟩ 55v5 as in Da. du. The remainder of these common lexemes\footnote{OGu. þū is the most common word in Gutaklag, appearing in 634 tokens in B; þā appears in 102 tokens.} are spelled with ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩ (§4.3.2), the latter also being the norm for Danish leading up to the Reformation (cf. Skautrup 1944, II, 47, 183). However, the use of ⟨d⟩ for pronouns and adverbs with original *þ also occurs in Danish during this period. In Bilefeld’s copy of the Danish ordinances in G we find e.g. a single token ⟨der⟩ 35v18 alongside 35 tokens of ⟨ther⟩ for Da. der rel pron ‘which, who’. Thus the tokens in B follow Danish practice of writing either ⟨d⟩ or ⟨th⟩ for da ‘then’ and du ‘thou’, and may have already occurred in the exemplar manuscript.

4.3.2 Lack of /þ/

Immediately apparent in the orthography of Codex B is the lack of the grapheme ⟨þ⟩, used in Codex A to indicated the dental fricatives [θ] and [ð]. Codex B contains only two tokens with ⟨þ⟩, both found in marginalia: 3 pl pres þula ⟨þula⟩ 32r ‘tolerate’ (§3.3.2) and eþa ⟨eþa⟩ 41r ‘or’ (§3.3.1). The latter is found in a marginal note that also contains examples of Bilefeld’s more usual renderings of the dental fricatives: word-initial ⟨th⟩ in nom pl masc þair ⟨thair⟩ ‘they’ and word-internal ⟨d⟩ in nom sg maþr ⟨madr⟩ ‘man’.

Danish manuscripts with ⟨þ⟩ are rare and limited to the earliest period (see e.g. Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, I, 76); in Sweden, the grapheme dominated until the fourteenth century (Westlund 2002, 846). Bilefeld follows the same pattern typical of Danish and later Swedish manuscripts, writing ⟨t th⟩ for the (etymological) voiceless [θ] and ⟨d dh⟩ for its voiced counterpart [ð].

Pipping (1905-07) argues for a complete lack of distinction between etymological [θ] and [t] in Bilefeld’s orthography, noting that “båda tecknas promiscue med t eller th” (1905-07, lxxxvii) [both are written indiscriminately with t or th], however, closer inspection reveals some pattern. Aside from the unetymological cases discussed in §4.1.1, initial ⟨th⟩ is limited to function words (pronouns and adverbs), e.g. þar ⟨thar⟩ 39/77 tokens ‘there’, nom-acc sg neut þitta ⟨thitta⟩ 9/10 tokens ‘this’. OGu. þā adv ‘then’ and þū pron ‘thou’ are found spelled with ⟨d⟩ (a Danishism; §4.3.1, ⟨th⟩, or ⟨t⟩. Lexical items (nominals and verbals), on the other hand,
are exclusively rendered with ⟨t⟩, e.g. þiaufr masc ‘thief’ 7 tokens, þing neut ‘general assembly’ 61 tokens, þriþiungr masc ‘third, riding (administrative division)’ 17 tokens.

Nevertheless, Pipping (1905-07) is right to argue that initial [θ] must have fallen together with [t] by the time of Codex B. Snædal (2002, 208 et passim) argues for the fifteenth century based on runic evidence, e.g. ta for þā adv ‘then’ and tretando for dat sg fem þrettandu ‘thirteenth’ alongside unetymological þ in lyftarðis for 3 sg pret dep lyftaþis ‘was finished’, all found on G 78, self-dated to 1487. Thus the occlusion of [θ] > [t] had already occurred by or around the time of the exemplar manuscript β1470.

Meanwhile the clear distinction between lexical items with ⟨t⟩ and function words with either ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩ is indicative of another change in the language, namely the voicing of weakly stressed initial [θ], evidenced in modern pronunciation: OGu. þū > Gu. dāu pron ‘thou’, þā > da adv ‘then’.

In- and auslaut

Voiced [ð] is usually spelled ⟨d⟩ or ⟨dh⟩ in Codex B, though ⟨t⟩ and ⟨th⟩ occur in a few tokens (see §4.1.1). Meanwhile, ⟨dh⟩ is never used for the voiced (lenis) plosive [d], although this may be found only in initial position, in geminates, and following nasals and l (cf. Noreen 1904, 174). Bilefeld never writes ⟨dh⟩ in the later Danish ordinances, suggesting this digraph derives from the exemplar manuscript β1470.

Following the resonant r, Bilefeld writes ⟨dh⟩ in five tokens in Codex B: nom sg fem berþ ⟨berdh⟩ 2v17 ‘delivered’, nom sg byrþ ⟨byrdh⟩ 7r21 ‘burden’, acc pl orþ ⟨ordh⟩ 2r11 ‘word’, 3 sg pres varþr ⟨wardh⟩ 1v15, 2r20 ‘becomes’. His preference, however, is clearly to write ⟨d⟩, which is found in more than three hundred tokens. Following g and f, Bilefeld always writes ⟨d⟩, never ⟨dh⟩, leading Pipping (1905-07, lxxvii) to suggest the occlusion of [ð] > [d] following the fricatives [ɣ] and [β]. A similar occlusion occurred in Faroese in e.g. bygd fem ‘village’, høvd neut ‘head’ (cf. Icel. byggð, höfuð) prior to the loss of ð (cf. Thraínsson et al. 2012, 401). It is furthermore possible that this occlusion after g (and presumably f) had already occurred prior to the copying of Codex A, considering ptc dat sg neut byghu ⟨bygd⟩ A 2r11, B 1r9 ‘inhabited’ in the preface (§5.1.1).

Bilefeld writes ⟨dh⟩ for post-vocalic [ð] in twenty-six lexemes in Codex B, all of which are found elsewhere in the manuscript spelled ⟨d⟩, e.g. prep meþ ⟨medh⟩ 2r18, 7r10, ⟨med⟩ 139 tokens ‘with’; nom sg mahṛ ⟨madher⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨mader⟩ 107 tokens ‘man’. Eventually [ð] became [d] everywhere in Gutnish (with the exception of unstressed forms such as Gu. me prep ‘with’ < meþ), a development which appears to have been well underway by the time of Codex B, though this distribution of ⟨dh⟩ in the manuscript retains traces of earlier stages.
Confusion of final þ, t

In general Codex B distinguishes between final -þ, spelled ⟨d⟩ or ⟨dh⟩, and final -t, spelled ⟨t⟩ or ⟨th⟩. There are, however, exceptions where final -þ is spelled ⟨t⟩ and -t ⟨þ⟩. Exceptions also occur in Codex A, where final -þ is spelled ⟨t⟩ and -t ⟨þ⟩. Two examples are common to both codices: Dat sg neut matnaþi ⟨maþnaþi⟩ A 6v3, ⟨madnadi⟩ B 7r5 ‘foodstuffs’ (cf. OGu. matr masc ‘food’) and Ptc nom pl neut skrifat ⟨scrifat⟩ A 41r12, ⟨schriffat⟩ B 55r6 ‘written’.

The use of ⟨t⟩ for final -þ is found in two more tokens in Codex B: OGu. miþ, mep prep ‘with’ is found once spelled ⟨mit⟩ 28r10 next to 139 tokens of ⟨med⟩, two ⟨medh⟩, and 11 ⟨mid⟩. This nonce spelling is likely taken from German (MHG, MLG mit). Meanwhile, OGu. hafuþ lutr masc ‘main portion (of an inheritance)’ is found once as acc sg ⟨haffut lut⟩ 41r7; Codex A likewise has unetymological ⟨t⟩ in a different token of acc sg ⟨hafut luth⟩ A 7v10. Overall the use of ⟨t⟩ for final -þ is more common in the older manuscript.

Confusion of final -t is more common in Codex B. No examples are found in the elder codex, though word-internally we find dat pl vitnum ⟨viþnum⟩ A 15v9 ‘witnesses’, which in Codex B reads ⟨widtnom⟩ 19r8. In the younger codex, we find three examples of ⟨d⟩ for final -t: Nom sg neut aflat ⟨afflad⟩ 28r18 ‘conceived’, acc sg neut samt ⟨sand⟩ 41v6 ‘true’, Nom sg neut tilskurat ⟨til schurad⟩ 13r3 ‘allocated’.

Exemplars with þ

Pipping ([1905-07], xliii) notes the occasional confusion of ⟨þ⟩ with ⟨g⟩ in Codex A, suggesting the graphemes were similar in the exemplar manuscript. Such a confusion is not found in Codex B, although twice another grapheme, ⟨p⟩, appears where we should expect an exemplar with ⟨þ⟩: acc sg griþkunu ⟨gripkunu⟩ 1 bis v1 ‘midwife’ and PTC acc sg neut gýtt or gýþt ⟨gypt⟩ 26v16 ‘approved’. Although the stem-final -þ of OGu. gýþa wk vb ‘to approve’ should likely assimilate with ⟨t⟩ in the participle, as in Codex A ⟨gyt⟩ A 23v16, the reading ⟨gifft⟩ D 28v19 (lit. ‘married’)

53The provision reads “thet ieru lag som hier ieru | schriffat i” 55r5-6 [This is the law which is written herein] in Codex B, where the pl verb shows concord with OGu. lag neut pl ‘law’. Codex A instead contains the 3 sg ir, which could point to a reinterpretation of lag as a neut sg, thus showing concord with PTC nom sg neut skrifat.

54Codex A (Guta lag and Guta saga) has 149 tokens ⟨miþ⟩, 24 ⟨mep⟩. Neither codex abbreviates with ⟨m⟩ as commonly found in Old Swedish manuscripts.

55Alongside hafuþ lutr, four examples can be found: Nom sg gullah ⟨Gullat⟩ A 42v1 ‘golden headress’, PTC nom sg fem luþaf (lufat) A 33v4 ‘promised’, adv oråþlita (oratlica) A 29r7 ‘thoughtlessly’, PTC acc pl neut (ai) sannah ⟨asannat⟩ A 37v9 ‘(not) verified’. Pipping ([1905-07], s.v. ‘sanna’) lists the final form as acc sg neut, though the noun phrase slik øqueþins orþ [such insults] is clearly pl. All corresponding tokens in Codex B are written with ⟨d⟩.

56Another token, (ertau ⸠ þ ⸡ gar) A 27v16 ‘ørtug (coin)’, should be added to this list; Pipping ([1905-07], 36) reads the deleted letter as ⟨r⟩, despite ⟨þ⟩ being quite clear.
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seems to correspond with the reading in Codex B (§ 3.2.1), with the neutralization of \( f \) and \( p \) before \( t \), thus pointing to an exemplar with \( ⟨þ⟩ \).

One token in A also shows the confusion of \( ⟨þ⟩ \) and \( ⟨p⟩ \) in the prologue, which contains the reading “oc hann \( ⟨þ⟩ \) hial\( ⟨þ⟩ \) par biþia” 2r7 [And he/him \( ⟨þ⟩ \) help\( ⟨þ⟩ \) there pray] where \( ⟨þ⟩ \) must be a misreading of a 3 sg pres \( hielpar \) ‘helps’; cf. “at han hielper oss” D 3r6 [that he help us] in the Danish translation (see also § 3.2.2).

Finally, the German translation has twice transferred OGu. \( ïþ \) fem ‘employment’ as \( ⟨iþ⟩ \) G 13va27, b8, indicating the exemplar manuscript also used \( ⟨þ⟩ \).

4.3.3  \( ⟨æ⟩ \) and \( ⟨ø⟩ \)

With a possible single exception (Figure 4.2), the graphemes \( ⟨æ⟩ \) and \( ⟨ø⟩ \) are completely absent from the main text in Codex A, as they represent sounds not present in the Old Gutnish inherited phonology. In Codex B, on the other hand, we find a few tokens of \( ⟨æ⟩ \) and \( ⟨ø⟩ \) in the Old Gutnish text. Apart from these tokens, examined below, we also find the graphemes used in Latin and Danish. The Latin gen \( ⟨iudæ⟩ \) 53v6 for the proper name \( Judas \) is found once in the main text alongside two tokens \( ⟨iude⟩ \) 49v16, 53r17; outside the main text, the colophon contains both Lat. \( ⟨præpositum⟩ \) 55r16 ‘provost’ and \( ⟨tertianæ⟩ \) 55r17 ‘third, riding’ occur. Marginal notes written in Danish on 41r contain Da. \( ⟨kiøbfærd⟩ \) ‘merchant trip’ and \( ⟨tørff⟩ \) ‘needs’.

Within the Old Gutnish text, \( ⟨æ⟩ \) is more common, occurring in sixteen tokens, though limited to four lexemes. Nine tokens occur in OGu. \( ⟨prestr⟩ \) masc ‘priest’, constituting roughly one-third of all tokens of this lexeme. A tenth token is abbreviated \( ⟨p̃stir⟩ \) 9v2, with \( ⟨æ⟩ \) added above the line by Bilefeld. Ten tokens contain \( ⟨e⟩ \), while the remaining 11 are abbreviated, usually with \( ⟨þ⟩ \).

The remaining four tokens of \( ⟨æ⟩ \) are found in the following three lexemes:

\( iæm \) adj ‘even, equal’. A single token \( ⟨iæm⟩ \) 23v18 is found alongside 6 tokens with \( ⟨e⟩ \) and 17 tokens with \( ⟨a⟩ \). — \( ⟨lesa⟩ \) vb ‘to read’. A single token is found in 3 pl pres dep \( ⟨læsas⟩ \) 54r6. — \( sēþ \) fem ‘seed’. Four tokens are found with \( ⟨æ⟩ \), four with \( ⟨e⟩ \).

The relative frequency of \( ⟨æ⟩ \) in \( prestr \) is best explained as Danish influence on the ecclesiastical vocabulary (§ 4.3.1). The question remains whether the encroachment of \( ⟨æ⟩ \) elsewhere reflects a change in pronunciation on the island at the time. Gustavson (1940, 57) notes short \( e \) developed into a more open vowel \( [æ] \) in Modern Gutnish, which Snædal (2002) attributes to Danish influence. Finding evidence in Reformation-age runic inscriptions on Gotland, Snædal (2002) concludes:

\[\text{Landsmålsalfabetet \([æ]\).}\]
Användingen av runformen ᚤ (ibland vänd ᚥ) i de yngsta inskrifterna tyder på inflytande från danskt skriftspråk och att uttalen eventuellt har börjat närma sig det danska [æ]. Runans former tyder dessutom på en viss kontakt med dansk och eventuellt svensk medeltida runtradition där ᚤ sedan slutet af 1100-talet var det gängse tecknet för [æ]. (Snædal 2002, 158)

[The use of the runic form ᚤ (occasionally reversed ᚥ) in the younger inscriptions indicates influence from the Danish written language and that the pronunciation had possibly begun to approach Da. [æ]. The forms of the rune also indicate some contact with Danish and possibly Swedish runic tradition, where ᚤ was the common sign for [æ] from the end of the 1100s.]

Thus ⟨æ⟩ in iemn, lesa, and prestr may reflect a change in pronunciation, considering the modern forms jämn (a side-form of jamn), läse, and präst. The vowel in OGu. sēp is long, however, and either remains a long closed monophthong [e:] (in the southern parishes of Gotland) or becomes a diphthong, either closed [ei], [ei], or [ai]. The use of ⟨æ⟩ in half the tokens of sēp should then be considered influence from Da. sæd; by extension, the other lexemes with ⟨æ⟩ are best argued to be taken from Bilefeld’s native language, Da. jævn, læse, and præst.

Unlike ⟨æ⟩, the grapheme ⟨ø⟩ represents a distinct phoneme in Old Gutnish, occurring in loanwords such as högsl neut ‘support’ and øl neut ‘beer’. The diphthong commonly spelled ⟨oy⟩, which developed into [iɪ] (Gu. āɪ) beginning sometime around the thirteenth century (cf. Snædal 2002, 200 et passim), may likewise have been pronounced with a front rounded ø-vowel as [øy] or [œy] in early Old Gutnish. Despite this, ⟨ø⟩ and its allograph ⟨ʊ⟩ are less common than ⟨æ⟩ in Codex B, occurring in only about half as many tokens.

Loanwords with /ø/ are typically written with ⟨o⟩, though ⟨ø⟩ is found in two tokens: 3 sg pres subj högsl ⟨högsli⟩ 27v15 ‘give support’ and nom sg øl ⟨φöl⟩ 32v9 ‘beer’. The latter loanword is found in one other token, gen sg øls ⟨ools⟩ 32v13 (with doubling of the vowel due to secondary lengthening; §4.3.5) and occurs frequently in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, spelled variously as ool, ol, ööl, and öel. The vowel quality of Gu. øl further indicates a loanword (cf. Gustavson 1940, 197). OGu. högsl neut ‘support’ and högsla wk vb ‘to give support’ are found in nine tokens with ⟨o⟩, though the quality of the vowel is supported by evidence from the German manuscript, which writes ⟨ø⟩ in multiple tokens, including the rubric “högsł oc ib” G 13va27 [support and employment] for the subchapter in Chapter 26.

58 Landsmålsalfabetet [øː], [ei], [ei], [oi].
59 Note, for example, the spelling ey in runic inscriptions from the twelfth through thirteenth centuries (Snædal 2002, 201).
60 Cognates of OGu. högsl and högsla are not known in other Nordic languages. Previous scholars agree the Old Gutnish must be a loan, pointing to MLG högen ‘to please, to comfort’ (e.g. Schlyter...
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Twice $\langle õ \rangle$ is found for expected $\langle oy \rangle$ in Codex B: DAT SG FEM ainloyptri $\langle$einløptri$\rangle$ 28r6 ‘unmarried’ and DAT SG ògøyslu $\langle$ogømslu$\rangle$ 17v6 ‘negligence’. The first token is in the elder codex as $\langle$einloypt$\rangle$ A 24v17 (with an unexpected rendering of ai; see §4.3.4 and Pipping [1901], 95), while the second is a hapax in B ($\S$6.1.2).

One token, 3 SG PRES doyr $\langle$døyr$\rangle$ 5r7 ‘dies’, may point to a pronunciation [øy] or [œʏ] of the diphthong typically given as $\langle oy \rangle$, though the form may also be influenced by Da. dør. In Guta saga, the token ACC SG oy $\langle$oy$\rangle$ A 44r4 ‘island’ could be read $\langle$øy$\rangle$ (cf. Pipping [1905-07], 63 fn. 2), providing another example of this fronted vowel, although the hairline stroke through $\langle o \rangle$ may instead belong to the following $\langle y \rangle$; see Figure 4.2.

Finally, true Danish influence can be found in three tokens of OGu. yfir PREP and ADV ‘over, above’: $\langle$øffuir$\rangle$ 19v10, 22v14, $\langle$offuer$\rangle$ 19v14. Only the final token aligns with Bilefeld’s orthography: in the Danish ordinances, we find 7 tokens of Da. over spelled $\langle$offuer$\rangle$. In Old Danish, the form øver (yver, etc.) also occurs (cf. Brøndum-Nielsen [1928-73], I, 311-315) and may be the source of the tokens in the β recension.

4.3.4 $\langle$ei$\rangle$ and $\langle$ey$\rangle$ for [ai]

The Old Gutnish diphthong ai (from PGmc. *ai) is typically spelled $\langle$ei$\rangle$ or $\langle$ey$\rangle$ in Codex B, whereas Codex A generally spells the diphthong $\langle$ai$\rangle$. The digraph $\langle$ai$\rangle$ is found in 45 tokens in Codex B, though is limited in its distribution in the younger codex.

$\langle$ai$\rangle$ in Codex B

Eight tokens of $\langle$ai$\rangle$ are found in marginal notes in Codex B, half of which are found in the marginal note on 41r: ADV ai $\langle$ai$\rangle$ ‘not’, ACC PL MASC flairin $\langle$flairin$\rangle$ ‘more’, NOM PL MASC þair $\langle$thair$\rangle$ ‘they’, and GEN PL MASC þaira $\langle$thaira$\rangle$ ‘their’. In other marginalia we find ai $\langle$ai$\rangle$ 25r ‘not’, GEN SG AINS ains $\langle$ains$\rangle$ 9r in the phrase útan þī at ains “unless”, NOM SG LEGBAIN $\langle$legbain$\rangle$ 21v ‘shinbone’ and DAT PL FEM tuaim

\[187\] s.v. ‘hogsl’; Pipping [1905-07], s.v. ‘hogsl’; see also Peel [2013], 137 note 20/60-61), though offer no explanation for the derivation with an sl-suffix. In Middle Dutch, however, we find such a derivation in booesel neut ‘increase; sum of an increase’ (Verdam and Ebbing Ewben [2002], s.v. ‘booschel’), while the Lower Saxon böchsel neut ‘support under a beehive’ has been known in beekeeping (Christ [1803], s.v. ‘böchsel’), pointing to a Low German provenance of the entire lexeme hogsl in the meaning ‘support’.

\[61\] See [1.4.1] on the explanation given by Björkman (1905), together with the rebuttal by Pipping (1905-07), regarding this form.

\[62\] In the compound yfir-klēþi neut ‘outerwear’.
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⟨twaim⟩ 21v 'two’. While the notes on 9r, 25r, and 41r may derive from Codex A (§3.3.1, §3.3.5), the note on 21v lacks a corresponding reading in the three other known recensions.

Four tokens are found in two lexemes in Chapter 24 which, as argued in §3.1.3, may derive from Codex A: DAT SG NEUT aïnu ⟨ainu⟩ 23v8, 10 ‘one’ and ACC PL NEUT flairi ⟨flairi⟩ ‘more’. Conversely, ⟨ei⟩ is found in three tokens in the same chapter: DAT PL twaim ⟨tweim⟩ 23v11, 13 ‘two’ and GEN PL þaira ⟨teira⟩ 23v8 ‘their’.

Otherwise the use of ⟨ai⟩ is limited lexically: OGu. aiga str vb 'to own' is found in the INF aiga ⟨aiga⟩ 50v16, while the related substantive aiga FEM ‘property’ is found once as ACC PL aigur ⟨aigur⟩ 33v15.

Finally, 30 tokens of the demonstrative pronoun are rendered ⟨thaim⟩ or ⟨taim⟩ instead of NOM SG FEM OF NOM-ACC PL NEUT þaun (OSw. þøn) due to the misreading of minims. Pipping ([1901], 79) considers the possibility that Bilefeld confused þaun and DAT þaim partly because dative forms had started to take on accusative function, already evident in Codex B. However, ⟨t(h)aim⟩ in Codex B almost always corresponds with ⟨þaun⟩ in Codex A. In a single exception, Codex A incorrectly has ⟨þaim⟩ A 5r10 for NOM SG FEM þaun, in reference to fyrska FEM ‘custom’:

B Teth ier nw thi nest at bloot ier man|nom mikit forbudit, oc fyrscha all | 'thaim'
    som heydnu fylgir. (4r12-14)

‘This is now the next: that heathen sacrifice is strictly forbidden, and all the old customs that follow heathendom.’

This confusion of NOM þaun and DAT þaim in Codex A cannot be due to the dative taking over the accusative function, nor is it a common error, as the form in Codex B points to an exemplar with ⟨þaun⟩.

That Bilefeld consistently read þaun as þaim is possible, as may be the case for the marginal note “fyri thaiñ” 7v [for them], which in Codex A reads “firi þaun” A 7r8 (§3.3.5). On the other hand, if Bilefeld’s exemplar had written both ⟨þaun⟩ for þaun and ⟨þaim⟩ for þaim, the two forms would have completely merged in Codex B as þaim. Instead, the use of ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩ for ai must predate the misreading of þaun as þaim, indicating the exemplar manuscript β1470 wrote the diphthong ai as ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩, as in Codex B.

⟨ei⟩ and ⟨ey⟩ elsewhere in the corpus

While Codex A generally spells ai with ⟨ai⟩, we also find ⟨ei⟩ in a few exceptional instances (cf. Pipping [1901], 91-95): DAT SG FEM ainloyptri ⟨einloyptri⟩ A 24v17 ‘unmarried’, NOM Farþaim ⟨farþeim⟩ A 10v16 ‘Fardhem’, PTC ACC SG FEM framraidda

61Note also the use of final ⟨u⟩, which is normally spelled ⟨o⟩ following ⟨n⟩; cf. §3.2.4.
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(fram reida) A 3v16 ‘paid’; inf vaita (veita) A 3v13, 16r11 ‘to grant’; 2 sg pres vaitir (veitr) A 10r18, 10r2 ‘grant’. The numeral OGu. tuair num ‘two’ is never spelled with ⟨ai⟩ in Codex A; instead we find nom masc ⟨tueir⟩ 9 tokens, ⟨tuer⟩ A 9r12; dat ⟨tueim⟩ 12 tokens, ⟨tuem⟩ 6 tokens. Pipping (1901) convincingly argues this anomaly to be due to a scribe whose orthographic norm included ⟨ei⟩:

[D]en person, som skrifvit cod. A, själf plägade skrifva ei, medan den handskrift han kopierade hade ai. Där orden i grundtexten voro utskrifna, segrade hans egen ortografi endast undantagvis [...] men i räkneorden, som i den äldre handskriften kunna hafva varit skrifna med siffror, blev ei regel. (Pipping 1901, 95; italics original)

[The person who wrote Codex A tended to write ⟨ei⟩, while manuscript he copied had ⟨ai⟩. His own orthography won over only occasionally where the words in the source text were written out fully [...] but in the numbers, which in the older manuscript could have been written with numerals, ⟨ei⟩ became the rule.]

The numeral ‘one’, on the other hand, is rarely abbreviated (partly due to possible confusion with OGu. ī prep ‘in’), explaining why the scribe of Codex A consistently writes the diphthong of OGu. am (stem ain-) as ⟨ai⟩, with the single exception in the compound ⟨einloyptri⟩ (Pipping, 1901, 95 fn. 1).

Within the runic corpus ei for expected ai appears infrequently, and notably all examples given by Snædal (2002, 199) are inscriptions from the northern riding of Gotland, which may speak for a regional difference in pronunciation: einn G 249; leiknar, leikụ G 309; sihleiker, stein G 322; reisa G 325. No examples are found in the runic calendars.

In the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, the diphthong is found as ai, äi, åy, ei, and ey, e.g. 3 sg pres aiger (var. äiger) StSC 26 ‘has’; 3 sg pres subj rāinse StSC 40 ‘clean’; dat pl fleirom StSC 19 ‘more’; ey (var. åy) StSC 15 ‘not’. Forms with a monophthong are also found, likely due to influence from the mainland: dat twem StSC 18, 73 ‘two’; nom pl masc the StSC 48 ‘they’ and dat them (var. thom) StSC 3 < Da. de, dem ‘they’ (OGu. þair, þaim).

Finally, both the German and Danish translations of Guta lag may derive from exemplars with ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩. In the German manuscript, we find OGu. baimfrīr masc ‘homestead sanctity’ given as ⟨heym vrede⟩ G 5rb24. Although both individual components are German (MLG heim ‘home’, vrēde ‘peace, sanctity’), the compound is clearly Old Gutnish and requires explanation in the manuscript: “das ist

64 Pro eiu? Cf. Snædal (2002, 151) and Säve (1859, 75 note 90).
65 The 1328 calendar contains some tokens with ai (Lithberg and Wessén 1939, 124), though no examples of the diphthong ai are found in the younger calendar from 1572, making it impossible to assert how the diphthong would have been spelled at the time.
66 Note also acc masc to StSC 26 ‘two’ < Da. to.
hūs vrede” G 5r6 [that is sanctity of the house]. In the Danish manuscript, OGu. laigu-lenningr masc ‘tenant’ is given as ⟨leigolenninger⟩ D 5r18; again, the Old Gutnish term requires explanation in the manuscript: “det er den som flytter | aff en sogn y en annen” D 5r18-19 [that is the one who moves away from one parish into another].

Origin of ⟨ei⟩ and ⟨ey⟩ in Codex B

It should not be surprising that a Danish-born, German-educated priest such as David Bilefeld would spell the diphthong [ai] as ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩, as this was the usual spelling in both German and Danish. Nevertheless, this spelling can be traced back to the exemplar manuscript β1470, if not further back, based on three pieces of evidence.

First, the tokens with ⟨ai⟩ in marginal notes indicate Bilefeld copied ⟨ai⟩ as such. As ⟨ei⟩, ⟨ey⟩ is likely to have been Bilefeld’s orthographic norm, these tokens with ⟨ai⟩ cannot be attributed to scribal slips and must then derive from an exemplar. On the other hand, this limited distribution of ⟨ai⟩ indicates the main exemplar did not use such a spelling.

Second, the confusion of NOM SG FEM, NOM-ACC PL NEUT þaun and DAT þaim must have arisen after ⟨ai⟩ had come to be spelled ⟨ei⟩, ⟨ey⟩; otherwise, þaun > ⟨þaim⟩ would have merged with original þaim and would be spelled with ⟨ei⟩, ⟨ey⟩ in Codex B.

Finally, evidence from the rest of the corpus shows ⟨ei⟩, ⟨ey⟩ were commonly used to indicate the Old Gutnish diphthong ai. That the runic material shows a preference for ei in the Northern Riding, where Bilefeld was provost at the time he copied Codex B, could point to a Northern pronunciation and may tentatively place the β manuscript tradition in this area of Gotland.

4.3.5 Doubling of Long Vowels

The practice of doubling vowel signs to indicate length increased over time in both Danish and Swedish manuscripts and it is no surprise that we find far more instances of this practice in Codex B than in the elder codex. Only a handful of examples can be found in Codex A, whereas in B any long vowel can be found

See e.g. Brøndum-Nielsen (1928-73, I, 61) and Wessén (1965, 32).

Pipping (1905-07, lii) lists nine examples where long vowels are written double in Codex A: NOM SG hān ⟨haan⟩ A 2v4, 3r2 ‘she’; NOM SG lās ⟨laas⟩ A 36r17 ‘latch, lock’; ADV sēn ⟨seen⟩ A 6r6; DAT sīr ⟨siir⟩ 4r10, 6r20, 15r2 ‘him, her, it (REFL PRON)’; NOM PL þār ⟨þaar⟩ 21v9, 48r6 (in Guta saga) ‘they’. A further three instances of doubled vowel signs do not correspond with a long vowel: NOM SG MASC hinn ⟨hiin⟩ A 15v4 ‘the (other)’, which Pipping (1905-07, xxxv, lii) explains as pure dittography, though a closer inspection of the manuscript shows the scribe initially wrote ⟨hn⟩, having added hairlines above the minims in ⟨n⟩ to indicate ⟨ii⟩; ACC SG mǐþsumar ⟨mǐþssu|umar⟩ A
written double, with the exception of ȳ.

Wessén (1965, 52) notes the Swedish practice of doubling vowel signs occurs most frequently in word-final position and commonly in word-initial position. In inlaut, doubling is more common in closed (especially final) syllables than in open, non-final syllables.

The pattern in Codex B is similar to that describe by Wessén (1965), though not entirely the same. Word-final doubling is only found in three lexemes, and may be indicative of Danish influence: 3 sg pres mā ‘may’ is typically spelled ⟨ma⟩, being found in 52 tokens. Two tokens are found spelled ⟨maa⟩ 12r14, 19v10, however, and may be traced to Bilefeld, who always spells Da. mā as ⟨maa⟩ in the later Danish ordinances (7 tokens). OGu. nū adv ‘now’ is found almost equally spelled ⟨nu⟩ (5 tokens) and ⟨nw⟩ (6 tokens). Whether the doubled spelling derives from Bilefeld or was already found in the exemplar manuscript is unclear; the later ordinances only have two tokens of Da. nu, both spelled ⟨nu⟩. Finally, the single token ⟨saa⟩ 4r18 for OGu. so adv ‘so, thus’ is taken by Pipping (1905-07, lxxxvi) to be a Danicism, though significantly Bilefeld has corrected the token from an original ⟨som⟩. In the later ordinances Da. sā is spelled both ⟨saa⟩ (8 tokens) and ⟨so⟩ (7 tokens).

In initial position, doubling of long vowel signs is only found in forms and derivatives of OGu. āt adv ‘out’. As a simplex or prefix, āt is spelled ⟨wt⟩ in the majority of tokens – 15 in total – being found spelled single once as ⟨vt⟩ 40r8 in the main text, and once ⟨ut⟩ 25r in a marginal note. The derived form ātan adv and conj ‘without; but, unless’ is most frequently spelled ⟨vtan⟩ (66 tokens) plus two tokens with ⟨u⟩, while a single token of the conjunction is spelled double as ⟨wtan⟩ 50v3. OGu. āti adv ‘outside’, on the other hand, is more commonly found spelled double as ⟨wti⟩ (5 tokens), being found only once spelled single as ⟨vti⟩ 12v6. This practice is in line with Bilefeld’s Danish orthography; in the later ordinances we find Da. ude spelled ⟨wdj⟩ twice, ⟨wtj⟩ in eight tokens, but ⟨vde⟩ G 41v2 in only a single token.

Doubling of long vowels in non-final open syllables is rare in Codex B, in line with the Swedish practice described by Wessén (1965). With the exception of OGu. ātan and āti mentioned above, whose six tokens with ⟨w⟩ may be due to their connection with āt, only a single token of a long vowel spelled double in an open syllable is found: dat sg bōli ⟨boolj⟩ 13r11 ‘farm’. When in a final syllable, ē is spelled ⟨oo⟩ in two tokens of OGu. bōl, including nom sg ⟨bool⟩ 13r3 on the same page, which may have influenced the anomalous spelling ⟨boolj⟩. However, the form is more likely due to influence from 3 sg pres bōr ⟨boor⟩ 13r14 ‘lives’ found on the following line.

9r18-9v1 ‘midsummer’, where the dittography is due to the page boundary (1905-07, xxxiv); 3 sg pres subj sīi ⟨sii⟩ A 11r10 ‘see’, which is disyllabic (Pipping 1905-07, lii).

69 OGu. āt- is found as a prefix in e.g. ātlendingr masc ‘foreigner’, ātgangin ptc ‘passed’. 
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Doubling in closed syllables

Otherwise doubling of long vowels is mostly confined to closed, frequently final, syllables. Long ā is the most common vowel to be written double, and is typically found in lexemes which have a close cognate in Danish (see Table 4.7). In the later Danish ordinances Bilefeld writes these cognates with ⟨aa⟩ in all positions, not only closed final syllables, e.g. ār ⟨Aar⟩ G 33v16, āret ⟨Aarit⟩ G 41r20, fā ⟨faa⟩ 35v10. Were Bilefeld responsible for the doubling of ā in these lexemes, we should expect more examples in final position and open syllables, which we do not find; the doubling of ā then likely derives from the exemplar manuscript β1470.

Bilefeld also frequently writes ⟨ee⟩ in the later Danish ordinances, though most tokens are cognates with an Old Gutnish lexeme containing the diphthong ai, e.g. Da. sten, OGu. stain ‘stone’. In Codex B only two lexemes are found with ⟨ee⟩ for long ē in a closed monosyllable: ēt fem ‘family, lineage’ (1/1 token) and þrēl masc ‘slave, thrall’ (2/24 tokens). That OGu. ēt contained a long vowel is evident not only in the DAT SG ēt ⟨eet⟩ 39r2 in Codex B, but also in the German and Danish translations, where we find the Old Gutnish term transferred over as ⟨eet⟩ G 20va16, D 41r8, pointing to exemplar manuscripts with doubled ⟨ee⟩. Doubling of ⟨tt⟩ in the corresponding token ⟨ett⟩ A 32v18 in the elder codex is likely a scribal error, as geminate *tt simplified to t after long vowels (§ 4.1.1); all four tokens of GEN SG étar are spelled with a single ⟨t⟩ intervocally, i.e. ⟨etar⟩, in both Gutnish codices.

Pipping ([1905-07], lv) argues the doubling of final ⟨l⟩ in OGu. þrēl in the Gutnish codices to indicate a shortening of the vowel. Final l is written double in 4/13 tokens in Codex A and 10/22 in B, in both the NOM SG (cf. Olcel. þrēll with ll < *lr) and ACC SG (Olcel. þrēl). The two tokens ⟨treel⟩ in Codex B speak against a

---

Table 4.7: Doubling of ā in closed syllables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>⟨aa⟩</th>
<th>⟨a⟩</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Cognate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ār</td>
<td>‘year’</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16 ār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fār</td>
<td>‘receives’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28 fār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hār</td>
<td>‘hair’</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7 hār</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lās</td>
<td>‘lock’</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 lās</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sār</td>
<td>‘wound’</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1 sār</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Footnotes:

70Four of the five Danish cognates are found in the ordinances, the only missing item being Da. lās ‘lock’. Although Da. fā ‘to get, to receive’ is not found in the 3 SG PRES, the SUBJ ⟨faa⟩ is found twice; bār is found in the compound hār-grāb ‘hair-grabbing’.

71The German manuscript was likely translated from an Old Gutnish original with ⟨ee⟩ in non-final syllables in the tokens of GEN SG étar, as we find double ⟨ee⟩ in “būten der eet” G 20va11 for ûtan étar [outside the family] and “etar manne” G 20va7 for étar menn [family members], as well as scribal errors pointing to ⟨ee⟩ in “eyd manne” G 20rb4 for étar manum [family members] and “echte manne schra” G 14rb19 (lit. ‘real personal register’) for étar manna skrå [family register].
shortening of ē: as with the doubling of ⟨ll⟩, these tokens occur both in the NOM sg and ACC sg. A long vowel furthermore survives in Gu. treil (found in the phrase arbeit sum an treil “to work like a slave”; cf. Gustavson 1918-1945, s.v. ‘träl’). As neither codex is consistent with its spelling of final l < *lr – Codex A, for example, writes 3 SG PRES vil ‘will; wishes’ (Olcel. vill) with single ⟨l⟩ in 35 tokens, double ⟨ll⟩ in nine – it is unclear whether this final l was long or short. The stem-vowel ē, on the other hand, was undoubtedly long.

Long ĩ is written double in five lexemes: lif neut ‘body’ (3/3 tokens), 3 SG PRES sîr ‘sees’ (1/1 token), DAT sîr refl pron (5/16 tokens), skîr adj ‘guiltless’ (1/8 tokens), NOM SG MASC þrîr num ‘three’ (7/8 tokens). Doubling in these tokens is almost always written ⟨ii⟩ (the sole exception being skîr), which is not found in Bilefeld’s orthography in the Danish ordinances, where i is occasionally written ⟨y⟩, e.g. ⟨syn⟩ for Da. sin ‘his, her, its’. This use of ⟨ii⟩ for long ĩ likely derives from the exemplar manuscript β1470. On the other hand, Bilefeld frequently writes ⟨y⟩ for Da. i ‘in’ (15/20 tokens in the later ordinances); that six of the 180 tokens of OGu. į are also spelled ⟨y⟩ can readily be attributed to Bilefeld.\footnote{Doubling in an open syllable is found in the foreign name Siｍon in the gen ⟨Simonis⟩ 53r17, found twice with ⟨i⟩ as ⟨Simonis⟩ 49v16, 53v6.}

Long ȯ is likewise often doubled in Codex B, though this cannot be attributed to Bilefeld, who never writes ⟨oo⟩ in the later Danish ordinances; instead, doubling of ⟨oo⟩ must have already occurred in the exemplar manuscript β1470. Doubling in closed syllables is found in OGu. bōt neut ‘(heathen) sacrifice’ (1/1 token), bōl masc ‘farm’ (2/9 tokens), bōt fem ‘fine, fee’ (14/16 tokens), 3 SG PRET fōr ‘went’ (1/1 token), bōr masc ‘adultery’ (3/5 tokens),\footnote{One token of single ⟨o⟩ is in the compound bōrdembr masc ‘adultery’.} and sōl fem ‘sun’ (1/2 tokens).

Apart from OGu. āt adv ‘out’ and derivatives mentioned above, long ā is written ⟨w⟩ in closed syllables in three lexemes: fiūrtān num ‘fourteen’ (1/1 token; see also §6.2.4), fūl adj ‘foul; guilty’ (3/3 tokens), and hūs neut ‘house’ (2/15 tokens). Bilefeld spells Da. hūs ‘house’ with ⟨w⟩ in 5/7 tokens in the later ordinances, and may be responsible for the two tokens of OGu. hūs with ⟨w⟩.

Secondary lengthening

Short vowels are lengthened secondarily in Gutnish as a result of a quantity shift affecting light syllables (short vowel followed by a short consonant) when word-final (VC) or followed by a vowel (VCV) or resonant (VCR), as seen in Table 4.8 (cf. Gustavson 1948, 107ff.).

For Old Swedish, Riad (2002a, 1103) notes the secondary lengthening of short vowels began in monosyllables (VC) around 1350, having later spread to polysyllables. In Codex B we find a handful of light monosyllables whose originally short vowels are written double, indicating traces of secondary lengthening:

\footnotesize
\begin{tabular}{l}
\hline
\begin{itemize}
\item Doubling in an open syllable is found in the foreign name Siｍon in the gen ⟨Simonis⟩ 53r17, found twice with ⟨i⟩ as ⟨Simonis⟩ 49v16, 53v6.
\item One token of single ⟨o⟩ is in the compound bōrdembr masc ‘adultery’.
\end{itemize}
\end{tabular}
Interpreting the tokens with ⟨aa⟩ as secondary lengthening presents no problem, as lengthened /aː/ < a and original /aː/ < ā merge in Modern Gutnish. The tokens with ⟨ii⟩, on the other hand, present a chronological problem: secondary lengthening of i must have occurred after the diphthongization of long ī > āi (see Gustavson 1940, 13ff.), as the two phonemes are kept distinct in Modern Gutnish. The earliest evidence of the diphthongization of long vowels in Gutnish is ĭ > öi, which began in the fifteenth century (Snædal 2002, 198), though there is no evidence for the diphthongization of ī > āi prior to the early sixteenth century (Pipping 1901, 89). As noted above, the use of ⟨ii⟩ for long ĭ is unusual for Bilefeld, and should be argued to have been present in the exemplar manuscript from 1470, thus prior to the evidence of this diphthongization.

The loaned phoneme /ø/ is always long in the modern language (Gustavson 1972-1986, xi), and may have been loaned in as phonetically long in OGu. øl, which would explain the doubling of the vowel in the token gen sg øls ⟨ools⟩ 32v13, despite not being in a light syllable.

### Potential homographs

Doubling of ⟨aa⟩ is maintained with some consistency in two lexemes to distinguish them from near-homophones with short a. OGu. hann pron ‘he’ (Olcel. hann) is spelled ⟨han⟩ in 57 tokens in the nominative singular, thus avoiding homography with OGu. hān pron ‘she’ (Olcel. hún) which is always spelled ⟨han⟩ in the nominative and accusative singular. In the elder codex hān and hann are kept distinct by the doubling of -nn for the masculine pronoun, though as shown above (§4.1.3), final geminate -nn is almost never indicated in Codex B. Confusion of hān and hann occasionally occurs in both codices, and must have occurred in earlier codices of Guta lag as well, as confusion of ‘he’ and ‘she’ is found in the German

---

74Changed from ⟨at⟩.
and Danish translations. In the following provision, for example, Codex B and the Danish translation both have the correct reading, while both A and G confuse the pronouns, though in different places:

\[ B \text{ Tha } | \text{ en kuna kenir ey man, oc schir } | \text{ schutar tan sik vm fyrsta dyger, si|dan } '\text{haan}' \text{ til Byar komber: oc lads } | \text{ sidan haffua kent man, sidan len|gra ier fram gangit: ta wers 'han' } | \text{ med xij. manna eydi, fyri theiri } | \text{ som ey ier haffandi (30v6-13)} \\
\text{‘When the woman does not acknowledge the man, though declares her case on the first day after she comes to town, and later claims to have known the man when more time has passed, then he may defend himself with a twelve-man oath, if she is not pregnant.’} \]

\[ '\text{haan}’ '\text{han}’ ] \text{ hann, hann A 27r11, 13; sy, sy G 16rb27, 16va1; hon, han D 33v2, 5.} \]

Perhaps unsurprisingly, the confusion of \textit{hān} and \textit{hann} occurs especially in provisions which discuss both men and women. In the following example, the confusion of the pronouns must have occurred prior to the copying of Codex B, as the following adjective is inflected for the new (incorrect) pronoun:

\[ B \text{ En barn fydin } | \text{ teyr som hogsl eyga vp taka: fad } | \text{ e} | \text{ e Broder en 'han ogipter ier'} (29r4-6) \\
\text{‘But they who take up child support feed the child: the father or brother if she is unmarried.’} \]

\[ '\text{han ogipter ier}’ ] \text{ han ogipt | ier A 25v13-14; sy nicht beraten ist G 15va7; hon vgifft er D 31r10.} \]

The addition of the \textsc{nom sg masc} ending \textit{−r} was likely influenced the following 3 \textsc{sg pres ier}, though it is nevertheless clear Bilefeld has written “if he is unmarried” rather than “if she is unmarried” as found in the other three codices.

\[ \text{OGu. } \textit{þār} \text{ fem pl pron ‘they’ (OIcel. } \textit{þær}) \text{ is distinguished from } \textit{þar} \text{ adv ‘there’ (OIcel. } \textit{þar}) \text{ only in the length of the vowel; in Codex A these two lexemes are written identically as } \langle \textit{þar} \rangle, \text{ with the exception of two tokens } \langle \textit{þaar} \rangle 21v9, 48r6 (in } \textit{Guta saga} \text{) for the pronoun ‘they’. Codex B, on the other hand, distinguishes } \textit{þār} \text{ and } \textit{þar} \text{ by writing the pronoun with } \langle \textit{aa} \rangle \text{ in ten tokens. Confusion — or perhaps blending — of the two lexemes nevertheless occurs in two examples:} \]

\[ B \text{ En men wilia } | \text{ henne mistroa om, oc 'engar hafuer } | \text{ haan taar witnis konur wider, som’ } | \text{ med henne waro ta en haan i Barnfa|rom war (2r15-19)} \\
\text{‘If men wish to disbelieve her, and she does not have (the) female witnesses (there/they) who were with her while she was in labor.’} \]

\[ '\text{engar hafuer } | \text{ haan taar witnis konur wider, som’ } ] \text{ engar hafr || han uitnis cuunur } \textit{þar} \text{ sum A 3r19-3v1, sy keyne czügwibe hat dy G 1va29; hon | haffuer ingin witnisquinner som D 4v6-7.} \]
Neither G nor D have included þār or þar in the translation, which Codex B clearly interprets as a pronoun ‘they’, whereas in Codex A either ‘they’ or ‘there’ are possible interpretations (Pipping 1905-07, 4 interprets the form in A as ‘they’).

In a second example, Codex B has interpreted an original þār as þar:

> B Gifftir || fadir son sen: doyr sonin oc leffuer dy|trir ept s ich: tha schulu ‘tar’ sithia | i karls schauti, oc Bida luta senna (24r21-24v3)

‘If a father marries off his son: if the son dies and leaves behind daughters, then they (there) sit in the householder’s [i.e. the grandfather’s] care and await their inheritance.’

The original reading is preserved clearly in all other manuscripts, including Codex A, which normally does not distinguish þār and þar.

### 4.3.6 u/n-Confusion

Confusion of minims is not uncommon in Codex B. Especially frequent is the confusion of the two-minim graphs ⟨n⟩ and ⟨u⟩. By the mid-fifteenth century Danish manuscripts began to distinguish ⟨u⟩ from ⟨n⟩ by adding a diacritic bow (Kroman 1943, 63) as we find in Bilefeld’s script (§ 2.1.1); it is thus possible the exemplar manuscript β1470 also used ⟨ū⟩, which would push the confusion with ⟨n⟩ further back in the β recension.

Some confusion of ⟨u⟩ and ⟨n⟩ in Codex B can be considered pure slips, such as acc sg masc huarn ⟨hwaru⟩ 18v18, 22r3, 25r17 ‘each’; the correct form also occurs as ⟨hwarn⟩ 10v19, 51v4. Other slips include ptc nom pl masc gangnir ⟨ganguir⟩ 3v13 ‘gone’ and dat sg kyrkiu ⟨kyrkin⟩ (interpreted as def?) 2v14 ‘church’.

Elsewhere entire paradigms have merged or lexemes reinterpreted in the younger codex due to the confusion ⟨u⟩ and ⟨n⟩. The synonymous OGu. aiga and aign, both fem ‘property’ (Olcel. eiga, eign), have nearly completely merged in Codex B (see Table 4.9). Only in the acc pl is aigur (from aiga) distinguished from aignir (from aign), though one token ⟨eygnir⟩ 8r2 for aign corresponds with ⟨aigur⟩ A 7r15 in the elder codex. The use of ⟨o⟩ for ⟨u⟩ in the acc sg aiga ⟨eygo⟩ 39r17, which corresponds with ⟨aign⟩ A 32v14 in the older codex, suggests this confusion was already present in the exemplar manuscript. Finally, one reading in Codex B has reversed the substantive meaning ‘property’ and OGu. aiga vb ‘to own’; the correct reading is found in A:

> A þair sum ‘aign | aighu a fasta’ (29v6-7)

‘they who own adjacent property’
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex B</th>
<th>aign</th>
<th>aiga</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>(eygu)</td>
<td>aign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC SG</td>
<td>(eigu) (eygu) (eygo)</td>
<td>aign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>(aigu) (eigu) (eygu)</td>
<td>aign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN SG</td>
<td>⟨eygu⟩</td>
<td>*aignar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOM PL</td>
<td>(eygur)</td>
<td>*aignir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC PL</td>
<td>⟨a⸌i⸍gur⟩ (eigur)</td>
<td>aignir</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨eygir⟩</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT PL</td>
<td>(eygnom)</td>
<td>aignom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN PL</td>
<td>(eygna)</td>
<td>aigna</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.9: Paradigms of OGu. *aign and aiga ‘property’ as found in Codex B.


OGu. rōfa fem ‘turnip’ (OIcel. rōfa) is only attested in the compound rōfn-akr masc ‘turnip field’, which is consistently spelled with ⟨u⟩ for n in Codex B: DAT PL ⟨Rofu Akrom⟩ 51r8, 57r14, GEN SG ⟨Rofu akers⟩ 51r10, ⟨Rofu ackers⟩ 51r13. The form ⟨rofu⟩ A 1vb5 is also found in the table of contents in Codex A, and could be interpreted as a GEN SG rōfu with regular loss of final -r in compounds. However, the main text of the elder codex uses the form ⟨rofn⟩ A 39r17, 19, 39v1, with n from the GEN PL inflection of weak nouns (Söderberg 1879, 40 fn. 2) with syncope of final -a. In Old Swedish laws, the GEN PL is used in compounds with aker masc ‘field’ or ruþa, ryþia fem ‘clearing’, e.g. ⟨rofnæ⟩ in Upplandslagen (Schlyter 1834, 271) and ⟨romna⟩ in Västmannalagen (1841, 163) with regular fn > mn.

Finally, OGu. þau adv ‘though’ (OIcel. þó) appears only once spelled ⟨thau⟩ 12v17. All other occurrences in Codex B are spelled ⟨tan⟩ or ⟨than⟩ and thus indistinguishable from OGu. þan conj ‘than’.

4.3.7 i-Umlaut

Old Gutnish i-umlaut has been widely discussed, especially during the first half of the twentieth century. Most commonly noted within scholarship is the presence...

75 Syncope of final -a is not regular in Old Gutnish, but occurs in the first member of another compound, namely GEN PL *gutna in gutnalþing, the name of the Gotlandic general assembly found in Guta saga as (gutnal þing) A 45v13 and suggests a regular simplification of *-a#a- > -a- in compounds. This preservation of an older GEN PL *gutna (OGu. gut ‘Gotlander’, GEN PL guta) was first proposed by Buggd (1891-1903, 152). Lindroth (1915) rejects the parsing of gutnalþing as *gutna alþing ‘general assembly of the Gotlanders’, proposing instead *Gutnal þing ‘Gutnal assembly’. The place-name Gutnal, Latinized Gutnalia in e.g. the monastery Sancta Maria de Gutnalia, he derives from *gutna ‘Gotlanders’ + *al ‘holy place’ < PGmc. *alb- (Goth. albs, OE ealh). Either interpretation nevertheless involves the syncope of final *-a in *gutna.
of elder \textit{i}-umlaut in light syllables\footnote{e.g. Pipping (1901, 96; 1904, 18-19), Carlsson (1921, I, 61), Wessén (1963, 18).} in stark opposition to the rest of Old Nordic, where syncopated \textit{i} only affects a preceding long syllable. Thus elder \textit{i}-umlaut is visible in all North Germanic reflexes of PGmc. \textit{*fardi-} ‘journey’ (OIr. \textit{ferd}, OSw. \textit{færþ}, OGu. \textit{ferþ}), while among reflexes of PGmc. \textit{*stadi-} ‘place’ \textit{i}-umlaut is only found in Gutnish (OIr. \textit{staðr}, OSw. \textit{staþer}, OGu. \textit{stær}).

Generalizing Old Gutnish as having “more instances of \textit{i}-umlaut than in other Scandinavian languages”\footnote{The past tense forms have also been leveled in Faroese: \textit{3 sg pret keypit}, \textit{neut ptc keypt} from \textit{inf keypa} < \textit{kaupa}.} (Peel 2015, 272) provides neither a complete nor an accurate account of the material. Instead, Old Gutnish \textit{i}-umlaut can best be characterized by synchronic variation on the one hand and a strong tendency toward paradigm neutralization on the other. Leveling is especially prevalent in the verbal system, where the presence or absence of \textit{i}-umlaut in the \textit{inf} is analogically introduced to the rest of the paradigm, e.g. \textit{3 sg pret segþi}, \textit{neut ptc segt} (OIr. \textit{sagði}, \textit{sagt}) from \textit{segia} ‘to say’; \textit{3 sg pres takr}, \textit{pret subj tōki} (OIr. \textit{tekr}, \textit{tǿki}) from \textit{taka} ‘to take’; \textit{neut ptc kaupt} (OIr. \textit{keypt}) from \textit{kaupa} ‘to buy’.

Variation of forms with and without \textit{i}-umlaut occurs between the two Gutnish codices, with neither manuscript showing a specific preference over the other. However, variation frequently occurs in sounds whose graphemic representations may have been confused or copied incorrectly, making it difficult to distinguish graphemic from phonetic variation. The present section examines three such instances: variation of \textit{a} with (umlauted) \textit{e}, \textit{u} with (umlauted) \textit{y}, and \textit{au} with (umlauted) \textit{oy}.

\textbf{Variation a : e}

Variation of \textit{(a)} and \textit{(e)} in the two Old Gutnish codices can have arisen due to mere copy error or slips, although instinctively we should expect a misreading of these two letters to only be possible, or at least more likely, in a cursive or hybrid script with a single-story \textit{(a)}. This would mean Codex B – whose exemplar manuscript β1470 is likely to have been written in such a script, considering the year of production – is more likely to contain an erroneous \textit{(a)} or \textit{(e)} than Codex A, written in a Gothic bookhand with a two-story \textit{(a)}, as its exemplar most likely also was.

Two tokens in Codex B contain a slip of \textit{(a)} and \textit{(e)}. The first, \textit{dat sg bragþi} \textit{(Bregdi)} 10v1 from OGu. \textit{bragþ} \textit{neut} ‘moment’, corresponds with \textit{(bragþi)} A 9v2 in the elder codex. Two tokens \textit{(bragþi)} A 48v1-2, 4 are also found with the expected vowel in Guta saga.

The second is found in Chapter 1, where the token \textit{3 pl pret segþu} \textit{(sagdu)} 2r11 ‘said’ from OGu. \textit{segia} \textit{wk vb} ‘to say’ lacks the expected \textit{i}-umlaut. While \textit{3 pl pret segþu} is otherwise unattested, \textit{sg segþi} shows the umlauted vowel from the infinitive
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has spread to the entire paradigm. The corresponding reading in the elder codes is not *segia* but rather 3 PL PRET *legbu* ⟨legbu⟩ A 3r15, which also shows a leveling of the *e* vowel from the INF *leggia* WK VB ‘to lay’ (also found in 3 SG PRET *leghi*). This reading ‘laid’ is further supported by the Danish translation, and is undoubtedly the original reading:

\[\text{B oc takin} \quad \text{hene ord aff bakj som a} \quad \text{an take-3 PL PRES SUBJ her-DAT words-ACC PL off back-DAT SG which on} \quad \text{‘sagdu’} \quad (2r11) \quad \text{said-3 PL PRET} \quad \text{‘and they take the words off her back which they said [leg. laid] upon her’} \]

\[\text{‘sagdu’} \quad \text{legþu A 3r15; laage D 4v2.}\]

It is unclear whether the ⟨a⟩ vowel in Codex B arose before or after the misreading of ⟨l⟩ as ⟨s⟩; either *segþu* or *legþu* could furthermore have been influenced by Danish preterite forms *sagde* ‘said’ or *lagde* ‘laid’.

Elsewhere variation between ⟨a⟩ and ⟨e⟩ in the two codices point not to scribal error, but to actual phonetic variation due to *i*-umlaut or other similar processes.

Three tokens of OGu. *draga, drega* STR VB ‘to pull, to draw’ are spelled with ⟨e⟩ in Codex B where Codex A has ⟨a⟩: INF ⟨drega⟩ B 12r14, ⟨draga⟩ A 11r7; 3 SG PRES SUBJ ⟨dregi⟩ B 12v6, ⟨dragi⟩ A 11v6; PL ⟨dregin⟩ B 13r6, ⟨dragin⟩ A 11r7. In a fourth token, the opposite occurs: 3 SG PRES SUBJ ⟨drage⟩ B 13r6, ⟨dregi⟩ A 11v16. Finally, Codex A has one token PTC NOM SG NEUT ⟨dregit⟩ A 19v13 in a provision missing from the younger codex. The remaining seven tokens are all spelled with ⟨a⟩ in both codices, as well as the substantive *drag* neut (found in the compound *bår-drag* ‘hair-pulling’) in a single token in each manuscript.

A variant of OGu. *draga* with a fronted vowel is unexpected as a reflex of PGmc. *dragan-*, which contains no trigger for *i*-umlaut. Nevertheless, the tokens with ⟨e⟩ point to a form *drega*, which is continued in Gu. *drágá* (var. *dragá*, cf. Gustavson 1940, 73). Similar infinitives with a fronted vowel are found in OSw. *drægha* (var. *dragha*) and ONw. *drega* (Olcel. *draga*), which Noreen (1904, 164; 1923, 149) explains as a blending of ablaut classes. Such a solution seems ad hoc, especially considering the ablaut row *a-ō-ō-*a from Class VI strong verbs (including *dragan-*) does not overlap with any other class in any principle part. An alternative solution given by Noreen (1923, 149) for ONw. *drega*, a leveling of the PRES SG *dregr* < *dregin* with *ik*-umlaut, cannot apply to Old Gutnish, which lacks *ik*-umlaut in the present tense of strong verbs (cf. 3 SG PRES *takr* ‘takes’). Nor does Old Gutnish display palatal umlaut (cf. OGu. PTC *takin* vs. Olcel. *tekinn* ‘taken’), another possi-

\[\text{Noreen (1904, 1923) speaks of a blending of Classes III (*bindan-*) and IV (*beran-*) with Class VI, to which *dragan-* belongs; however, Class V (*geban-*) would be more relevant, considering both Classes V and VI contain stems ending in a single, non-resonant consonant.}\]
ble catalyst for the e-vowel in the Old Norwegian infinitive. The likeliest solution is foreign influence, either from Norwegian or possibly from MLG dregen (var. dragen) STR VB ‘to pull, to draw’.

The commonly cited OGu. stæþr, steþr masc ‘place’ is always found with ⟨e⟩ in Codex B, in a total of five tokens. Codex A, on the other hand, has a token acc sg stæþ (stæþ) A 26v8 in Guta lag, as well as three tokens with ⟨a⟩ in Guta saga, alongside five tokens with ⟨e⟩. Fronting due to i-umlaut must have originated in the pl *steþir < PGmc. *stæþiz and eventually led to a split paradigm. In the modern language, both Gu. städ masc ‘place’ and stad masc ‘id.’ survive, while stad masc ‘city’ has two plural forms, stadar and städar.

The long stem vowel of OGu. bēþir, bāþir pron and conj ‘both’ is non-umlauted ā throughout the paradigm in Codex B. Codex A, by contrast, has ē in most tokens in Guta lag, with two exceptions: NOM NEUT bāþi (bāþi) A 22r10, DAT bāþum (bāþum) A 19v8-9. The use of ā in Codex B aligns with Guta saga, which has three tokens (bāþi). I-umlaut in masc bēþir, fem bēþar is unique to Old Gutnish, and must have spread from the neut bēþi (OIcel. bǽði, OSw. bǽði), of unclear origin.

Today only forms without umlaut survive: masc badar, fem bada, neut badi.

Variation u : y

More frequent is the variation between the high back vowel u and umlauted y. Pipping (1905-07, xliii) attributes the recurrent use of ⟨u⟩ in Codex A to an exemplar with a script in which ⟨y⟩ closely resembled ⟨u⟩:


[The archetype of the law seems, for its part, to have had a great similarity between u and y. By this assumption, a uniform explanation is reached for fulgin [B fylgin] 7:22. burþi [B byrdi] 10:15. butr [B byr] 14:15. buti [B Byti] 43:22. Note also that fyli in Codex B [51:21] is likely a misspelling for fuli. B 45r shows a change of fyli to fuli.]

79 I have previously discussed this form in Vrieland (2011, 14-16). Note also that Da. sted NEUT ‘place’ (pl. steder) and stad COM ‘city’ (pl. steder) arise from a similar split paradigm; cf. Brøndum-Nielsen (1928-73, III, 100-106).

80 The short vowel of GEN begga is nevertheless retained.

81 De Vries (1961, s.v. ’bǽði’) suggests PGmc. *bæþiu, noting OHG bēdiu, Ásgeir Blöndal Magnusson (1989, s.v. ’báði’), on the other hand, considers final -i in OIcel. bǽði to be analogous from þessi NEUT PL ‘these’.
Graphemic confusion of ⟨y⟩ and ⟨u⟩ could only arisen, to my mind, in one of two ways. One option is that /u/ was written with the grapheme wynn ⟨ƿ⟩ or vend ⟨ꝩ⟩, which often resembles ⟨y⟩. This option is problematic considering the provenance of Guta lag, as the insular graphemes wynn and vend are limited in Old Nordic manuscripts to Norway and Iceland (cf. Hreinn Benediktsson 1965, 22).

The other possibility is that the sound /y/ was written with a ⟨u⟩-like grapheme, for example a crossed ⟨ʉ⟩, known from early Danish manuscripts (cf. Nielsen 2002, 853-854). Crossed ⟨ʉ⟩ varies with ⟨y⟩ in e.g. the late-thirteenth-century fragments of Valdemars Sjellandske lov (Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 24 4to) and Knud Juul’s copy of the medical treatises by Henrik Harpestreng from the early fourteenth century (Copenhagen, Royal Library, NKS 66 8vo). This practice of using ⟨ʉ⟩ for /y/ is not known in Sweden, a Gutnish exemplar with ⟨ʉ⟩ may indicate Danish scribal influence on the early manuscript tradition of Guta lag, which was instigated under a Danish archbishop (§ 1.3.1).

Misreading ⟨ʉ⟩ as ⟨u⟩ is then the likeliest explanation for the tokens in Codex A cited by Pipping (1905-07, xliii), as we should expect i-umlaut throughout the paradigms of OGu. byþr fem ‘birth’, byþa wk vb ‘to pay a fine’, and fyþgia wk vb ‘to follow’. An even clearer example is the defective reading ⟨fyþ yr⟩ A 21r18, which in Codex B reads gen sg fyþur (fydur) 24r12 ‘food, nourishment’.

Variation of ⟨u⟩ and ⟨y⟩ in Codex B, on the other hand, always occurs in phonetic environments in which i-umlaut could apply. Söderberg (1879, 17) readily attributes forms of OGu. fuli, fyli masc ‘stolen goods’ with ⟨y⟩ in the younger codex – nom sg ⟨fyli⟩ 45r13, 47r6 – to copy error, which Pipping (1905-07, xliii) also finds probable (“sannolikt”). Noreen (1923, 317-318), on the other hand, finds umlauted variants of masc n-stems in e.g. OSw. klævi (var. klavi) ‘yoke, fork’, skaþi (var. skaþi) ‘damage’, as well as OGu. fyli. The Old Swedish forms cited all occur in Västgötalagen, which may point to a development Gutnish shares with Geatish (Sw. Götamål).

OGu. rygr, rugr masc ‘rye’ is found in two tokens in each codex: acc sg ⟨Rygh⟩ B 53r10, ⟨rug⟩ A 40v6 and gen sg ⟨rug⟩ar B 25r17, ⟨rygar⟩ A 22v3. Today only umlauted Gu. ſġ survives, though considering the form derives from a short i-stem PGmc. *rugi- (OICel. rugr), we should expect to find the same variation in i-umlaut as in staþr, steþr < *stadi-. Thus the use of ⟨y⟩ and ⟨u⟩ in both manuscripts in opposite tokens need not derive from a confusion of ⟨ʉ⟩ and ⟨u⟩, but could point to a phonetic variation of /y/ and /u/.

OGu. ypin, uppin adj ‘open’ is always found with ⟨y⟩ in Codex A, showing the same umlaut as in OSw. ypin < PGmc. upina-. In Codex B, on the other hand, the

---

82 Cf. Noreen (1904, 36, §23.1 Anm. and ref.) who notes “Die hdschr. haben sehr selten ⟨u⟩ [the manuscripts very seldom have ⟨u⟩] in reference to the Old Gutnish forms cited by Söderberg (1879, 5 fn. 1). Elsewhere in Old Swedish /y/ can be spelled ⟨iu⟩ or ⟨yu⟩ (Rydqvist 1850-1874, IV, 86-87).

83 Cf. also Söderberg (1879, 5 fn. 1).
tokens nom sg neut ⟨vppit⟩ 19v7 and acc sg fem ⟨vpni⟩ 4v18 point to a reflex of PGmc. *upana- (OIcel. opinn) without i-umlaut. Bilefeld has also altered a token nom sg neut ⟨ypit⟩ A 50v6 in Guta saga to ⟨vppit⟩, clearly showing the Danish priest understood the Gutnish form to contain /u/. Although umlauted Gu. ypen dominates in the modern language, non-umlauted uppen occurs as a variant on Fårö, notably with the same geminate /pp/ as in the token in Codex B, indicating an Old Gutnish variation of ypın, with umlaut and single /p/, and uppin, without umlaut and with geminate /pp/. 

Finally, Codex B contains both ⟨y⟩ and ⟨u⟩ in i-stems with heavy stem-syllables, which likely points to variation in the stem vowel. Thus OGu. fundr, fyndr fem ‘a finding’ is found as nom sg ⟨funder⟩ 41r3 and dat sg ⟨fynd⟩ 51v5 with ⟨y⟩, as in Codex A, but also dat sg ⟨fund⟩ 51v9 and gen sg ⟨funder⟩ 41r3 (read fundar) with ⟨u⟩. Likewise OGu. skuld, skyld fem ‘debt; expense’, which only occurs in the pl, is always found with ⟨y⟩ in Codex A; in Codex B, on the other hand, only ⟨u⟩ occurs: nom pl ⟨schuldir⟩ 42v10, ⟨schuldr⟩ 42v18, dat pl ⟨schuldom⟩ 52v5. The related skuldr, skyldr adj ‘guilty’, which is not found in Codex A, also occurs once with ⟨u⟩ alongside three tokens with ⟨y⟩ (see §6.1.5). While the attestations in Codex A all point to /y/, Codex B shows these long-stemmed i-stems contained the same variation of i-umlaut as found elsewhere in Old Nordic, e.g. OIcel. fundr vs. ONw. fyndr, OIcel. skuld, skyld, OSw. skulder, skylder.

There are thus no clear indications of graphemic confusion of ⟨ʉ⟩ and ⟨u⟩ in Codex B.

Variation au : oy

Variation of ⟨au⟩ and ⟨oy⟩ is less common in the manuscripts, but still occurs. One token in Codex A, ⟨þaigin⟩ A 22v16, which should read þoygin ‘however; but not’ as in Codex B (þoygin) 25vmargin, can best be explained as a two-stage process: a misreading of ⟨oy⟩ as ⟨au⟩ followed by a misreading of ⟨au⟩ as ⟨ai⟩. Confusion of ⟨au⟩ and ⟨oy⟩ in Codex B must be behind ⟨loyst⟩ 49v19, which on the surface appears to be a participle of OGu. lossa wk vb ‘to loosen’, but corresponds with the adverb laust ‘loose(ly)’ in Codex A, which reads “til þes tima sum menn hafa wana | haft at laust lata” A 38v5-6 [until that time it is customary to let (the rams) out]. The reading in A aligns with the phrase láta laust ‘to let go; to let loose’ in Old Icelandic, whereas the use of a participle in B is syntactically peculiar.

84Read upna; Codex A ⟨ypna⟩ A 42r3.
85Note the same variation is found in Old Frisian open < *upina-, open < upana- (Boutkan and Siebinga 2005, s.v. ‘open’).
86The origin of the geminate is unclear, being a separate development from Sw. öppen (via Hesselman’s Law, cf. Rand 2002a, 1103-1104). However, gemination is also found in Dalecarlian, e.g. Elf. uppin ‘open’ < *upana-. Notably, Proto-Dalecarlian also appears to have preserved both Proto-Germanic variants, as Orsa ippin (with i < ‘y’) must derive from PGmc. *upina-.
4.3. VARIATION IN CODEX B

OGu. noyðga wk vb ‘to force’ is found in the sup (neygat) 16r16 in B, which could possibly be the result of a similar confusion of ⟨oy⟩ and ⟨ai⟩ as in þoygin ⟨þai-gin⟩, though may simply be the confusion of ⟨o⟩ and ⟨e⟩.

A misreading of ⟨oy⟩ and ⟨au⟩ is argued in §6.3 to have occurred early in the history of Guta lag in the lexeme axlarþoyþ fem ‘shoulder height’.

4.3.8 Lowering [yer] > [yar]

Lowering of yer (or yar) to yar occurs to a differing degree across the East Nordic area, including Gotland. The details of this sound change are not fully clear, as it does not affect all instances of yer, and is stronger in some dialects than in others. Wessén (1965) notes:

Kort ä öppnas till a i ljudförbindelsen vär, men i olika utsträckning i olika diakroner, mera östligt än västligt, mer i trycksvag ställning än i tryckstark, mer om v föregås av en konsonant (d.v.s. är y) än om det är uddljudande. (Wessén 1965, 55)

[Short ä lowers to a in the phonetic sequence vär, though to a different degree in different dialects, more in the East than the West, more often in weak position than stressed, more often if v is preceded by a consonant (i.e. is y) than if it is in anlaut.]

Examples of this development are found in Codex A, such as INF vara ‘to be’, which is found in six tokens alongside earlier vera in eight. The elder codex generally preserves earlier yer, however, e.g. huer PRON ‘each, every, which (of many)’, which is kept distinct from huār PRON ‘each, which (of two)’ in writing, and verþa STR vb ‘to become’, which is kept distinct from varþa wk vb ‘to guard’.

In Codex B, on the other hand, this lowering resulted in the conflation of forms, at least in writing. Thus OGu. verþa, varþa STR vb ‘to become’ is indistinguishable from OGu. varþa wk vb ‘to guard’ in the infinitive, though 3 sg pres varþr ‘becomes’ and varþar ‘guards’ are kept distinct. For the pronouns meaning ‘each (of two)’ and ‘each (of many)’, a complete merger may have taken place, such that original huār PRON ‘each (of two)’ (OICel. hvárr) in the DAT SG MASC ⟨hwa|riom⟩ 32r11-12 and NEUT ⟨hiario⟩ 10v1 have taken the glide /i/ from the paradigm of huer, huar – DAT SG MASC ⟨hvariom⟩ 2r2, NEUT ⟨hiario⟩ 50r10 – whereas Codex A has MASC ⟨huarum⟩ A 28r17, NEUT ⟨huariu⟩ A 9v2 for huār, but MASC ⟨huerium⟩ A 3r5, NEUT ⟨hueriu⟩ A 38v13 for huer.

According to Pipping (1905-07, lxxxix), the lowering yer > yar is nearly complete in Codex B in certain lexemes. Notably, these lexemes also have a in Modern
Swedish: andverþa > andvarþa wk vb ‘to be responsible for’ (Sw. antvarda),
andverþr > andvarþr adj ‘(from the) beginning’ (Olcel. andverðr; cf. Sw. place-name Antvarden, Hellquist [1957], s.v. ‘antvarda’); buer > buar pron ‘each, every, which (of many)’ (Olcel. hverr, Sw. var, varje); quer > quar adj ‘remaining’ (Olcel. kvirr, kyr ‘still, quiet’, Sw. kvar ‘remaining’); vera > vara str vb ‘to be’ (Olcel. vera, Sw. vara); verþa > varþa str vb ‘to become’ (Olcel. verða, Sw. varða). These lexemes are spelled with ⟨a⟩ in every token, indicating a fully completed lowering of ⟨uþar⟩ by the time of Codex B. Notably, ⟨uþar⟩ is also evident in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, where we find e.g. wara StSC 12, Hwar StSC 23, and wardä StSC 23.

OGu. forvarþa str vb ‘to disappear’ is only attested in Codex B (§ 6.2.2), though shows the same lowering *uþar > þar (cf. Olcel. fyrirverða).

Lowering uþar did not occur in all lexemes, however. The following show no traces of lowering in Codex B, nor are they lowered in Modern Swedish:
sueria str vb ‘to swear, to promise’ (Olcel. sverja, Sw. svara);
sverþr neut ‘sword’ (Olcel. sverð, Sw. svärd);
vegþueri masc ‘blockade’ (cf. Olcel. þverr adj ‘across’, Sw. tvär);
verildsmaþr masc ‘layman’ (Olcel. verǫld fem ‘world’, Sw. värld);
veria wk vb ‘to defend’ (Olcel. verja, Sw. värja);
verl neut ‘work, deed’ (Olcel. verk, Sw. värk);
verkia wk vb ‘to ache’ (Olcel. verkja, Sw. värka);
ver, verri adv ‘worse’ (Olcel. verr, Sw. värre);
verþ neut and verþr adj ‘worth’ (Olcel. verð, verdr, Sw. värđ). To these can be added vereldi neut ‘weregild’ and ver fem, ‘lip’ (Olcel. vǫrr), which lack cognates in Modern Swedish.

4.3.9 Lowering [uþ] > [ↄl]

OGu. u lowers to [ↄ] before l plus non-dental consonant (Gustavson 1940, 134ff.), e.g. OGu. stulpi masc ‘pole, post’ (acc pl stulpa G 9; Olcel. stolpi) > Gu. stålpe. Before l plus dental (including l), however, u remains: OGu. nom masc sg fullr, neut fult adj ‘full’ (Olcel. fullr, fult) > Gu. fuldar, fult.

While Codex A always preserves u before l-clusters, forms with o begin to dominate in Codex B o:

- fulk neut ‘folk, people’ (Olcel. folk; Gu. fàlk): nom-acc ⟨folck⟩ 5 tokens, dat sg ⟨folcke⟩ 33r4, ⟨folcki⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨folki⟩ 52v14, 53r4. – gulf neut ‘floor’ (Olcel. golf; Gu. gálh): acc sg ⟨golff⟩ 18v6, 38r12, dat sg ⟨gulffi⟩ 16v9. – mulka vb ‘to milk’ (Olcel. molka; Gu. mälke): inf ⟨molka⟩ 43v8.

87OGu. andverþa, andvarþa is not to be confused with Olcel. andvarða wk vb ‘to hand over’ (Sw. antvarda) < PGmc. *anda-wardōjan-; rather, it is a loan from MLG antwarden antwerden ‘be responsible for’.

Influence from Danish may explain such forms as *folk*, a relatively common word (cf. § 4.3.1), and *molka*, considering the early Danish variants *molke*, *målke* (Da. *malke*). Likewise the variation found in OGu. *gulf, golf* may be due to Danish influence, though in one of two ways. While in general *u* predominates in Da. *gulv*, as in early Old Gutnish, forms with *o* are known from early East Danish sources up to the fifteenth century (Hansen 1962, 46). A Scanian scribe could be responsible for the forms *golf*, though Bilefeld could equally be responsible for *gulf* if the Gutnish form had already lowered to *golf*.

Taken all together, however, these forms speak for a regular lowering of *ul > ol* before non-dental consonants. Before dental clusters, Codex B always preserves *u*:

- **bult** neut ‘(sacred) grove’ (OICel. *bolt*; not found in Gu.): acc sg ⟨hult⟩ 4r15. – **fulla** vb ‘to fill’ (OICel. *fylta*; Gu. *fylle*): 3 sg pres ⟨fullar⟩ 47v3; subj ⟨fulli⟩ 53r3; 3 pl pres dep ⟨fullas⟩ 45r18. § 4.3.7. – **fullr** adj ‘full’ (OICel. *fullr*; Gu. *fuldar*): nom-acc sg neut ⟨ful⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨fulth⟩ 1v9, ⟨full⟩ (pro full) 35r1; dat sg neut ⟨fullo⟩ 15r16, 18v5, ⟨full⟩ 5v8; acc pl neut ⟨fulla⟩ (pro full) 30r8. – **gielda** vb ‘to pay’ (OICel. *gialda*; Gu. *gälde*): ptc ⟨guldin⟩ 4 tokens; neut ⟨guldit⟩ 47r9; dat sg fem ⟨guldinne⟩ 3r9. – **gull** masc ‘gold’ (OICel. *gull*; Gu. *gull*): gen sg ⟨gulds⟩ 3 tokens, ⟨guls⟩ 15r21, 33r17. – **gullap** neut ‘golden headdress’ (OICel. *gullhlað*): nom sg ⟨Gullad⟩ 33r13. – **skuld, skyld** fem ‘debt, expense’ (OICel. *skuld*; Gu. *skuld*): acc pl ⟨schuldir⟩ 42v15, ⟨schulder⟩ 42v18; dat pl ⟨schuldom⟩ 52v5. § 4.3.7. – **skyldr** adj ‘related’ (OICel. *skyldr*): nom sg masc ⟨schulder⟩ 48r13. § 4.3.7.

Despite being limited to only a few lexemes, the near perfect distribution of ⟨o⟩ before *l* plus non-dental and ⟨u⟩ before *l* plus dental speaks for the lowering of *ul > [ɔ]* having already taken place in Gutnish by the time of Codex B. The runic corpus supplies no new evidence for the dating of this development (forms such as nom sg *fulk* G 119 and dat sg *hulmka-* for *Hulmgardr* prop ‘Novgorod’ predate Codex A), though in the *Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild* the form acc pl *folck* (var. *folk*) StSC 52 suggests this development had occurred by the fifteenth century.

### 4.4 Discussion

As I have argued above (§ 2.4), David Bilefeld’s interest in copying Codex B as a personal reference tool has consequences for how the language in the manuscript can be studied and understood. That Bilefeld copied a language which was not his own, though closely related to his mother tongue affects the types of interference we can expect in the manuscript, which can be described as a language contact situation. Moreover, the language he was copying was likely to have undergone significant developments from the thirteenth century, when *Guta lag* was first codified, to the sixteenth, when Bilefeld sat down to copy the text.
We cannot speak of an Old Gutnish written standard, as there were no scriptoria on Gotland and by the Late Middle Ages, the language of administration had become Danish rather than Gutnish. A writing convention for Danish, on the other hand, was well established in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, and many of these orthographic norms are present in Codex B. The lack of word-final geminates on the one hand, and the doubling of word-final /l/ on the other, both point to Danish convention, and are both present in Bilefeld’s hand in the later Danish ordinances. Likewise the doubling of /k/ as ⟨ck⟩ following resonants and the use of ⟨ffu⟩ for word-internal ⟨f [β]⟩ both point to Danish orthographic convention, rather than phonetic developments. The consistency with which these spellings are used further point to David Bilefeld as the source of these orthographic features.

At the lexical level Danish influence – or rather interference or transfer – is especially prevalent among the core vocabulary, including common as well as technical vocabulary such as legal and ecclesiastical language, for which a close Danish cognate (homophonous diamorph) is found.

Yet not all Danicims can be attributed to Bilefeld, but must have been present in the exemplar manuscript. It is clear from the distribution that the exemplar wrote the Old Gutnish diphthong /ai/ with ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩, which may or may not be due to Danish (or German) influence. The distribution of ⟨i⟩ and ⟨e⟩ in final syllables clearly point to a Danish scribe who is not David Bilefeld.

The orthography of Codex B also bears witness to true Gutnish forms, both older features no longer present in the elder codex, such as the diphthong /ia/ via breaking, as well as later developments, such as the lowering of /uI > ol/. Despite heavy influence from Danish, the language of Codex B is decidedly Gutnish, though witness to younger developments. These developments are especially evident in the morphology, as discussed in the next chapter.
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5.3 Discussion

Codex B largely preserves the rich morphology of Old Gutnish, a fully-inflecting language similar to Old Icelandic (cf. Kristoffersen 2002) and Old Swedish (cf. Delsing 2002). Nominal morphology includes three genders (MASC FEM NEUT), two numbers (SG PL), and four cases (NOM ACC DAT GEN). Nouns are either indefinite or suffixed with a definite article, while adjectives have both a strong and weak inflection. Finite verbs inflect for person (1 2 3), number (SG PL), tense (PRES PRET), and mood (IND SUBJ); verbs may likewise be suffixed with -s (from PN *sir) that performs numerous functions (passive or middle voice, reflexivity, etc.) and is here referred to as deponent (DEP). Non-finite verbal forms include an infinitive (INF), a present participle (PRES PTC), and a past participle (PTC) with an adjectival inflection.

Modern Gutnish, by contrast, has lost much of the morphological complexity of the medieval language. While the nominal system still retains three genders and two numbers, the case system has all but disappeared, leaving only traces in set phrases such as til körkur ‘to church’ (OGu. til prep ‘to’ + GEN SG kyrkiur; cf. Säve 1859, xv). The personal endings have likewise largely disappeared from the
verbal system (though the variant spoken on Fårö still preserves some distinction, especially in the modal verbs; cf. Gustavson [1977], 34).

The transition from the rich morphological system of Old Gutnish to the reduced morphology of the modern language did not happen at once, but gradually over time; the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, for example, show a less complex morphology than Guta lag or Guta saga as found in Codex A, though the text still maintains much of the Old Gutnish system. Reduction and other changes within the morphology are also found in Codex B, the subject of the present chapter.

Unlike phonological change, morphological change is often irregular and differs per paradigm. The first section investigates a handful of individual paradigms which differ in Codex B due to various processes of leveling and reduction. Apart from these paradigms, more noteworthy general developments occurred in the nominal morphology, a selection of which is treated in the second section. These discussions regarding morphology occasionally overlap with syntax, which is otherwise outside the scope of the present study.

5.1 Individual paradigms

Individual paradigms were subject to various phonological processes, reductions, and leveling, resulting in Codex B often showing a younger form of the paradigm than what is found in Codex A. Comparative evidence from elsewhere in the Old Gutnish corpus, especially the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, often reveals intermediate stages, while further reduction and simplification of the paradigms continued into the modern language. The present section discusses these developments in several individual paradigms in Codex B.

5.1.1 aiga

The irregularity of the preterite-present verbs, which inflected as preterites in the present tense, made this class especially susceptible to analogical change and leveling during the (pre-)history of the Nordic languages. Of the fifteen reconstructable preterite-present verbs for Germanic (see Ringel [2006], 260-262), only ten are found in Old Nordic; though the irregularities of the present stem were often analogi-

---

1 Cf. Sturtevant’s Paradox (§1.5.1).
2 OIcel. eiga ‘to have; to own’, kná ‘I can; I know how’ (inf unattested), kunna ‘to be able’, mega ‘may’, muna ‘to remember’ (and the derived muni ‘will, shall’), skula ‘shall’, umna ‘to grant; to love’, vita ‘to know’, þorfa ‘to need’. An eleventh, OIcel. duga wk vb ‘to suffice’, is not found as a preterite-present in Nordic, having analogically developed into a regular (weak) verb in the prehistory of North Germanic. In Old Gutnish in five preterite-present verbs are attested in the pres: aiga ‘to have; to own’ (3 sg á, 3 pl aiga), kunna ‘to know; to be able’ (sg kann, pl kunnu), maga ‘may’ (sg mā, pl magu), skula ‘shall’ (sg skal, pl skula; §5.1.3), þorfa ‘to need’ (sg þarf, pl þorfu; §5.1.8). A
5.1. INDIVIDUAL PARADIGMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PGmc.</th>
<th>Codex A</th>
<th>StSC</th>
<th>Codex B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 SG</td>
<td>*aih</td>
<td>ā</td>
<td>→ aigr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 PL</td>
<td>*aigun</td>
<td>aigu</td>
<td>aigu (?)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1: Present stem of OGu. *aiga 'to own'  

cally removed, e.g. OIcel. 3 pl pres *vita → vita 'know'.

The original present forms of OGu. aiga pret-pres vb 'to have, to own' is completely preserved in both Guta lag and Guta saga in Codex A: 3 sg pres ā (OIcel. ā, Goth. aih) < PGmc. *aih, pl. *aigu (early OIcel. eigu, Goth. aigun) < PGmc. *aigun. In Codex B, on the other hand, we find leveling in both the singular and the plural:

3 SG PREP aigr (late OSw. āgher, āger): ⟨eig e⟩ 46r14, ⟨eyger⟩ 22 tokens, ⟨eygher⟩ 4r9, ⟨eig⟩ 7r2.  
3 PL PREP aiga (late OIcel. eiga; late OSw. āgha, āgha): ⟨eyga⟩ 11 tokens, ⟨eygha⟩ 7 tokens, ⟨aiga⟩ 50v16.

The same leveling of the singular is found in the Statutes of St. Catherine's Guild (see Table 5.1), spelled aiger (var. äiger) StSC 26, though the document preserves the older plural form as aigo StSC 64. This latter form may, however, be influenced by early Sw. pl. ägo (note 1 pl pres ägom StSC 5, which is Swedish).

Codex B nevertheless preserves traces of the older forms, though these are often subject to misinterpretation or scribal error. Three examples are found in Chapter 38, which otherwise has five tokens of 3 SG PREP aigr and two tokens of pl. aiga. Twice Bilefeld has added ⟨A⟩ 35r4, 26r12 where the elder codex has 3 SG PREP ā; in the first, an original punctuation character ⟨/⟩ has been deleted, and a new one added to separate ⟨A⟩ from the following word (see also Figure 5.1):

B  an | aff teim som mest | | ^A/\ Schal fyrsta til | eyds at ganga (35r3-5)

‘One of them who owns the most must deliver his oath first.’

^A/\ ] a A 29v1.

In the second example, ā has been added above the line, despite the original verb ā being present:

sixth, vita 'to know', can be added to the list based on the modern language: Gu. vitā, sg vait, pl. vitu.

For examples in early Old Icelandic, see Larsson (1891, 368-369); for ONorw. vitu, see Holtsmark (1953, 731-732).

One token changed from ⟨eygr⟩ 34v10.

With unexpected ⟨a⟩, cf. §4.2.5.

Including ⟨eygir⟩ 36r in the margin (§ 5.3.2).
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Figure 5.1: AM 54 4to 35r4. Image: Suzanne Reitz.

B  som han "A' garda] fyrir (36r12)
   ‘For which he owns fences’

"A' garda’] garþ | a A 30r18-19.

Here ⟨garda⟩ has been reinterpreted as ACC PL garþa ‘fences’ rather than SG garþ as found in Codex A, giving rise to the need for the verb ā ‘has’ elsewhere in the clause.

A third token from Chapter 38, 3 PL PRES aigu ⟨eigu⟩ 35r10, appears to have been confused with the oblique form of the substantive aiga fem ‘property’:

B  Ortar | witnj bierin teir som ‘eigu eygna | fasta’ (35r9-11)
   ‘Those who own neighboring land bear witness’

‘eigu eygna | fasta’] aign | aighu a fasta A29r6-7.

The defective reading in B arose via multiple errors, including the confusion of ⟨u⟩ and ⟨n⟩ in both ACC SG aign ‘property’ and 3 PL PRES aigu ‘own’ (cf. §4.3.6), and the reinterpretation of aigu + ā ‘on’ as a single (non-existent) verb ‘aigna.

A further example of confusion is found on the following recto, which reads “than som ey ta fast” 36r10, in which the finite verb ā (or aigr) is missing; Codex A here reads “sum ai a. tafast” A 30r17 [who does not own adjacent to the road]. This haplography is perhaps more likely to have occurred if the exemplar manuscript had the single-character form ā rather than the longer form aigr, yet the preceding provision on the previous line contains the longer form in Codex B: “som ta fast eyger” 36r9 [who owns (property) adjacent to the road].

Outside of Chapter 38, we find a defective reading pointing back to an older ā:

B  badi qwindi oc ke’r’ldi som liauta | ‘agha’ (39v16-17)

‘agha’] a A 33r11; paa D 42r4.

The reading in Codex B suggests a PL aiga, though in Codex A the SG ā is clear. The older form of the singular was likewise preserved in the δ recension, having been misinterpreted as OGu. ā PREP ‘on’ in the Danish translation.

Considering the evidence from the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, the leveling of OGu. ā → aigr had already occurred by the time β1470 was copied. The evidence
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masc</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Neut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>⟨annar⟩</td>
<td>⟨annat⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annarr</td>
<td></td>
<td>annat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC SG</td>
<td>⟨annan⟩</td>
<td>⟨andra⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annan</td>
<td>aðra</td>
<td>annat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>⟨adrom⟩, ⟨androm⟩</td>
<td>⟨andri⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ǫðrum</td>
<td>annarri</td>
<td>ǫðru</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN SG</td>
<td>⟨annars⟩</td>
<td>annarrar</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aðrir</td>
<td>⟨andræ⟩</td>
<td>⟨annor⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nom pl</td>
<td>⟨adrir⟩, ⟨andrir⟩</td>
<td>⟨adrar⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aðrir</td>
<td>aðrar</td>
<td>ǫnnur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC PL</td>
<td>⟨adrar⟩</td>
<td>⟨andræ⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aðrar</td>
<td>aðrar</td>
<td>ǫnnur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT PL</td>
<td>⟨adrom⟩, ⟨androm⟩</td>
<td>⟨androm⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ǫðrum</td>
<td>annarr</td>
<td>ǫðrum</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN PL</td>
<td>⟨andra⟩</td>
<td>annarr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>annarra</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2: annar(r) pron ‘second, other’ in Codex B and Old Icelandic. Only one further form can be added from elsewhere in the corpus: NOM SG FEM annur CR 16:12.

from Codex B suggests Bilefeld copied from an exemplar with this form as well as the PL aiga, an update in the language which should perhaps be attributed to a Gutnish, rather than Danish, scribe, and thus earlier in the β recension than the direct exemplar. The runic corpus adds no evidence for when this leveling may have occurred, as the 3 SG PREs is only found as a, though always in the phrase a mik ‘owns me’, a set phrase which could easily retain the older form; the 3 PL PREs aíhu G 249 is attested once on an inscription that pre-dates Codex A.

5.1.2 annar

As elsewhere in Old Nordic, the paradigm of OGu. annar pron ‘second, other’ is marked by consonant variation due to the development of PN *mär > -þr- (cf. Noreen 1904, 176-177), yielding a paradigm with the stem ann- in some cases (NOM SG MASC annar, Oldel. annarr) and apr- in others (NOM PL MASC aprir, Oldel. aðrir). Leveling of the latter stem is already present in Codex A, though not fully implemented, such that we find both the phonetically regular DAT SG MASC aprum as well as the leveled form andrum with restored -n- and epenthetic -d- (§ 4.1.6). The same variation is found in Codex B (Table 5.2).

Both stems are found throughout both manuscripts, with no apparent systematic distribution. For example, younger (leveled) forms with -ndr- are found in
Chapter 19, presumably one of the older layers of *Guta lag* (§3.1.3), while older forms with *‑þr‑* are found in Chapter 79, one of the fourteen younger chapters at the end of the text (§3.1.9). Nevertheless, the two codices align closely in their distribution of *‑þr‑* and *‑ndr‑* forms, agreeing in 38 out of 40 tokens. The only two mismatched tokens are DAT SG MASC ⟨andru⟩ A 37r2, ⟨adrom⟩ B 45v2 and DAT PL FEM ⟨aþrum⟩ A 30r14, ⟨androm⟩ B 36r6.

Codex B displays another layer of development within the paradigm, namely the reduction of three-syllable forms to two syllables. Thus B shows DAT SG FEM ⟨andrj⟩ 7r10 where A has ⟨anna|ri⟩ A 6v7-8 and GEN SG MASC ⟨andri⟩ 36v19 where A has ⟨anna|rir⟩ A 30v17-18. Finally, the GEN PL has been reduced from a trisyllabic ⟨annara⟩ A 4v17, 13v19, 15v8 to disyllabic ⟨andra⟩ B 15r22, 17r13. No tokens of (originally) trisyllabic forms are found in *Guta saga* (or the runic corpus), making it impossible to determine whether this contraction had already occurred by the time Codex A was copied.

One token in Codex B ultimately derives from the misreading of a trisyllabic form:

\[
\text{B} \quad \text{Tha en madher leyger | Aker, ella engh, yr ‘Annars’ kirkio sochn (3v19-20)}
\]

‘[Annars’] annari A 4v18; eyma another G 2va22; en annen D 6r8.

Recensions α, γ, and δ all read “another parish”, likely the original reading. The change from “another” to “another’s” in the β recension would have arisen via the misreading of trisyllabic DAT SG FEM annari as GEN SG MASC annars.

Finally, both Gutnish manuscripts contain unexpected final *‑r* in a single token ACC PL MASC *aþra* ⟨aþrar⟩ A 41r7, ⟨adrar⟩ B 54r7. Pipping ([1905-07], xviii fn. 1) lists these forms among the errors common to the two codices (§3.2.1), as the expected form should be *aþra* (OICel. *aðra*), following the regular declination of adjectives (e.g. ACC PL MASC *alla* ‘all’). The referent of the token is OGu. *øyrir* MASC *øre* (name of a coin):  

\[
\text{B} \quad \text{ta Byti prestir pro[asti xij. oyra oc ‘adrar’ xij. sochn. (54r6-7)}}
\]

‘Then the priest pays 12 *øre* in compensation to the provost and another twelve to the parish.’

‘[adrar]’ aþrar A 41r7.

Provisions with a similar structure are frequent in *Guta lag*, though the amount paid is always given in marks; the referent of annar is thus OGu. *mark* FEM, e.g.

---

7 On the loss of *‑r*, see §5.2.3.
8 Corresponding with NOM SG MASC ⟨annar⟩ 3v18 in Codex B.
9 Note, however, the contraction of trisyllabic forms had already occurred in the paradigm of OGu. *nequar, naquar* PRON ‘somebody’ (§5.1.4).
“ta schal | prestir Byta proasti iij. Markr oc adrar | iij. Markr sochninnj” B 54r1-3 [Then the priest shall pay 3 marks in compensation to the provost and another 3 marks to the parish], found in the same chapter (79). Considering 9/10 tokens of ACC PL FEM aþrar (andrar) are found in this construction, it is not unreasonable to assume this was the source of the unexpected -r in the single ACC PL MASC token; these errors in A and B could furthermore be polygenetic. The opposite error, ACC PL FEM aþra (þra) A 46v6 with missing final -r, is found once in Guta saga.

5.1.3  giera

The 3 SG PRES of OGu. giera wk vb is as a rule disyllabic gierir in Codex A (cf. OIcel. gerir) but monosyllabic gier in Codex B (cf. OSw. gør). Disyllabic forms, which are analogical from other verbs of the same class, are known in Old Swedish and Old Danish (gører, etc.), though monosyllabic forms generally dominate in East Norse (Noreen 1904, 463; Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, VII, 388-389).

Monosyllabic gier is used without exception in Codex B. While the elder codex typically uses a disyllabic gierir, one token gier (gier) A 41v11 occurs in Chapter 82, which is the only example of a 3 SG PRES in the later additions to the law (§3.1.10). Assuming the form is not a scribal error, this token indicates the monosyllabic form had entered the language by the fourteenth century. No examples are found in Guta saga (Pipping 1905-07, 60 fn. 2), the runic corpus, or the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, though Modern Gotlandic exclusively uses monosyllabic 3 SG PRES gär.

5.1.4  nequar, naquar

Originally trisyllabic forms of OGu. nequar, naquar indef pron ‘somebody’ are commonly contracted to two syllables in Codex B, e.g. ACC PL MASC nakkra (nakra) 26v5, whereas Codex A generally retains trisyllabic forms as in nequara (nequara) A 23v9. The two codices differ in the stem vowel as well: all tokens in Codex A (both Guta lag and Guta saga) are spelled with ⟨e⟩, while Codex B only has a single token ACC SG NEUT nequat (nequat) in a marginal note on 41r (§3.3.1), all other tokens being spelled with ⟨a⟩.

A contraction of the phrase *ne wait ek hwariʀ (Hellquist 1957, s.v. ‘någon’), the pronoun shows wide variation across the Nordic languages and through time. For Icelandic, Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874, s.v. ‘nekkvarr’) posit the following five stages from early OIcel. nekkverr > Icel. nokkur:

1. Loss of -j- in the paradigm, which originally inflected as OIcel. hverr ‘each’:
   NOM PL FEM nekkverjar > nekkverar.
2. Lowering of stem-vowel e > a: nekverar > nakkverar.
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3. Umlaut of a > ɔ (later o) and rounding of ve > vo: nakkverar > nokkvorar (> nokkvorar).

4. Loss of -v-: nokkvorar > nokkorar.


Gutnish also underwent some of these changes, such as stage (1), which was completed before Codex A was copied, as seen in dat sg net nequaru ⟨nequaru⟩ A 17r4, leaving no trace of *-j- in the paradigm. Stages (2) and (5) also occurred in Old Gutnish, though not in the same order as in Icelandic.

The stem vowel of OGu. nequar, OIcel. nekkverr derives from the contraction of PGmc. *ai before consonant clusters (*ne wait ek hwariʀ > *naitkhwærʀ > nequar, nekkverr).\(^{10}\) Noreen (1904, 417) notes the form nequar is unique to Old Gutnish among the East Nordic languages; in Old Swedish the stem vowel is either (long or short) a or o (ODa. o, ø, or u; cf. Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, V, 396), indicating stage (2) had already been completed on the East Scandinavian mainland by the time of the earliest manuscripts. In Old Gutnish, on the other hand, the lowering of e > a occurred after the contraction of trisyllabic forms (stage 5), as seen in two tokens in Codex A: nom pl fem nekkrar ⟨neccrar⟩ A 22r16 (Guta lag) and dat sg masc nekkrum ⟨necru⟩ A 47v4 (Guta saga).

Codex B, on the other hand, shows two tokens of uncontracted forms with a stem vowel a: dat sg neut naquaru ⟨naqwaru⟩ 19r18 and acc pl masc naquara ⟨naqwara⟩ 47v13. This likely shows synchronic variation between long and contracted forms, which was retained after the lowering of the stem vowel (i.e. nequarum, nekkrum > naquarum, nakkrum).\(^{11}\) Thus the chronology of OGu. nequar, naquar may be summarized as follows:

1. Loss of *-j- in the paradigm (pre-literary): nom pl fem *nequarjar > nequarar.

2. Occasional contraction of trisyllabic forms: nequarar > nekkrar.


\(^{10}\) Except endings with -rV-, i.e. gen pl nokkurar, gen sg fem nokkurar, and dat sg fem nokkurri. Unfortunately, none of these forms are attested in Old Gutnish.


\(^{12}\) Possible explanations may include dialect variation, or an intentional scribal change ⟨e⟩ > ⟨a⟩ at some point in the β recension. Considering the syncope of -ua- is not regular in Old Gutnish, the shortened forms must derive from irregular shortening in rapid speech, for which synchronic variation is not uncommon; cf. the occasional syncopated pronunciations of En. prob(a)bly, fam(i)ly, etc.
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5.1.5 skula

Characteristic of early Old Gutnish are forms of the modal verb *skula* pret-pres vb ‘shall, must’ without *sk-*., e.g. 3 sg pres *al*, pl *ulu*, a feature shared with Elfdalian [Noreen 1904, 253]. In Codex A these older forms are found alongside younger forms with *sk-* (3 sg pres *skal*, pl *skulu*), whereas Codex B almost exclusively uses the younger forms.

A single token of an older 3 sg pres *al* is found in Codex B in Chapter 25:

\[\text{B Ta en so taker noytas, at iord ward til fydur selia | fry allir sein magandi, ta ’al’ festa Al|dra imnt, oc ey at fastu selia (24r11-13)}\]

‘If the need arises to sell land for food before all [children] have come of age, then it shall be pledged from all equally and not sold immediately.’

The only other token of OGu. *skula* in the chapter is 3 pl pres *skulu* ⟨schulu⟩ 42v2, found as ⟨schulu⟩ A 21v9 in the elder codex, and may indicate *sk-* first spread to the plural, a system inherited by Codex B in Chapter 25, and later spread to the singular. On the other hand, the possibility of scribal error, perhaps due to nom pl masc *allir* ⟨allir⟩ 24r13 or gen pl *allra* ⟨Al|dra⟩ 24r13-14 ‘all’ found on the same line as ⟨al⟩ cannot be ruled out.

Strictly speaking, we cannot attribute the spread of *sk-* to leveling, as it is not clear whether *sk-* less forms were found throughout the paradigm, as in Elfdalian, or only in the present tense, as only 3 sg pres *al*, pl *ulu* are attested. It is furthermore possible both forms with and without *sk* existed in variation in Old Gutnish, with *sk-* less forms eventually being phased out.

5.1.6 vär, ōr-

Six occurrences of the 1 pl poss adj *vär* ‘our’ appear in Guta lag – five in the preface, and one in the opening sentence of Chapter 1. In the earliest stages of Old Nordic, the paradigm alternated between two stem forms, depending on whether the ending began with a consonant or a vowel. Thus in the Old Icelandic masc

\[\text{Kock (1896, 37-38) explains *les* forms such as OGu., Elfd. 3 sg pres *al* as a reanalysis of *k*-less forms (cf. Gm. *sollen*, Du. *zullen*) following pronouns, e.g. *es sal ‘he/which shall’ > *es al.}^1\]

14 *inf ulu, 3 sg pres al, pl ulu, 3 sg pret ullde, sup ulad*, etc.

\[\text{Brøndum-Nielsen (1928-73, V, 92) describes the Nordic development as *unzaraz > *unrar(a)r > *ūrar, *ōrar > *ūar, *ōar > vārr, though he does not further explain the differing stems. Meanwhile, the standard rule *vår* before a consonant, *ōr* before a vowel gives no phonological explanation for such an alternation. We may postulate, however, that the variation *vår*, *ōr* and the initial sound of the ending are both byproducts of Proto-Nordic syncope. Endings beginning with a consonant do so because of a syncopated third syllable, e.g. nom sg masc *unzaraz > *ōzar, with subsequent loss of medial *-r- (due to distant dissimilation) > *ōar and later resyllabification to}

[^1]: Kock (1896, 37-38) explains *les* forms such as OGu., Elfd. 3 sg pres *al* as a reanalysis of *k*-less forms (cf. Gm. *sollen*, Du. *zullen*) following pronouns, e.g. *es sal ‘he/which shall’ > *es al.

[^2]: Brøndum-Nielsen (1928-73, V, 92) describes the Nordic development as *unzaraz > *unrar(a)r > *ūrar, *ōrar > *ūar, *ōar > vārr, though he does not further explain the differing stems.
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### Table 5.3: 1 pl poss adj in Old Gutnish and Old Icelandic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masc</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Neut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>uar G 36</td>
<td>or G 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC SG</td>
<td>oarn G 158</td>
<td>ora G 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td>⟨orum⟩</td>
<td>⟨oram⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC PL</td>
<td>⟨orar⟩</td>
<td>⟨oram⟩</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT PL</td>
<td>o-om G 107a</td>
<td>⟨orom⟩</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 5.4: 1 pl poss adj in Codices A and B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codex A</th>
<th>Codex B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG MASC</td>
<td>⟨orum⟩ 2r10, ⟨orum⟩ 2r13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG FEM</td>
<td>⟨vari⟩ 2r10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG NEUT</td>
<td>⟨oru⟩ 2r11, 17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT PL NEUT</td>
<td>⟨orum⟩ 2r4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Old Gutnish, the nominal paradigm the stem vár- (from earlier *ūar- with resyllabification) occurs in NOM várr, ACC várn, GEN várs, while the stem ór- occurs in the DAT várum. The same alternation is found in Old Gutnish in Codex A and the runic material (Table 5.3).

Codex B shows the paradigm underwent the same leveling as in the other standard Nordic languages, e.g. Icel. vor(t), Sw. vår(t). The Modern Gutnish forms indicate otherwise, however. Most forms found on the island show a leveling of the stem òr-, such as ònar (Lau parish) from older òræ (cf. Gustavson 1972-1986, s.v. ‘vår’). The Fårö form òurr, on the other hand, must go back to an earlier *ūar-, showing no indication of resyllabification to *wär-. Further evidence for a lack of resyllabification can be found in the runic inscription G 158 (self-dated to 1305), where ACC SG MASC oarn must be read as óarn, occurring alongside two tokens of the verb uar (i.e. 3 SG PRET war).

Guta saga contains one token of the possessive pronoun, namely the DAT SG NEUT vāru ⟨waru⟩ (44v8). This token, which is the only example of a 1 PL in reference to the Gotlandic people, is found in the narrative interpolation “oc enn hafa þair suint | af waru mali” A 44v8 [and still they have some of our language], which immediately follows another ‘oc enn’ interpolation, namely “oc enn byggia” A 44v8 várr. Vowel endings, on the other hand, stem from an original long vowel which resisted syncope, thus causing syncope in the second syllable instead, e.g. NOM PL FEM *unzarōz > *ðóræk > óar.
[and still inhabit]. That this sentence is a later addition in the text would explain the use of the younger form vāru in a case which formerly would have őr-; cf. ⟨oru⟩ A 2r10. A similar spread of this form is found in the dat sg masc urum DR 373, in the thirteenth-century Gutnish inscription on the Ákirkeby baptismal font on Bornholm.

Though it is unclear whether Bilefeld’s exemplar manuscript β1470 used ⟨or⟩ or ⟨war⟩ – the latter being more likely, considering the consistency in Codex B – the β recension of Guta lag ultimately stems back to an archetype with ⟨or⟩. Evidence for this change is found in the first chapter, where the two codices share a mistake, namely the use of the possessive pronoun vār in the final sentence:

A  Oc ‘or’ sei mest þarf (2r13)
    and our-gen be-subj most need
    ‘And may be most necessary for us’

‘or’ ] war B 1bisr12.

In Old Icelandic copular sentences with the noun þǫrf ‘need’ take dat and gen themes, as found in Hávamál:

Hm  matar ok vāða es manní þǫrf (Finnur Jónsson 1932, 21)
    food-gen and clothing-gen is man-dat need-nom
    ‘The man needs food and clothing’

The archetype of Guta lag presumably had the same construction, with the dat experimenter os. Comparison with the Danish (δ) and German (γ) translations of Guta lag further indicates a dat construction:

*GL  ok *os séi mest þarf
    and us-dat be-3 sg pres subj most-nom need-nom
    ‘and (that which) we need most’

] vnde vns czu notorft G 1ra16; oc oss kan mest vere till notte D 3r13.

These errors in Codices A and B must derive from a misreading of os as őr prior to the change őr > vār evident in the β recension. The Old Gutnish text behind the translated manuscripts cannot be known for certain, though the use of MLG uns and Da. os ‘us’ point to an Old Gutnish original with os.

5.1.7 vera, vara

The sound development yer > yar (§1.3.8) affected the paradigm of OGu. vera, vara vb ‘to be’ in the inf vera > vara and sup verit > varit. This development had already occurred by the time of Codex A, as both older and younger forms are
found: \inf \langle\text{vera}\rangle 8 \text{tokens}, \langle\text{vara}\rangle 3r17, 12r16, \langle\text{wara}\rangle 4 \text{tokens}; \sup \langle\text{ve|rit}\rangle 15v16-17, \langle\text{varit}\rangle 13r15. Two tokens \text{wara StSC} 12, 72 are also found in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild. Codex B has fully integrated the younger forms, using ⟨a⟩ in all tokens: \inf \langle\text{vara}\rangle 14 \text{tokens}; \sup \langle\text{varit}\rangle 14v13, \langle\text{wari|th}\rangle 18r4-5.

Characteristically Gutnish is the broken form of the 3 sg pres ind \ier, \pl \ieru (still heard on the island as Gu. \text{jär, järu}) alongside unbroken \sg \ier, \pl \ieru. While in Codex A unbroken forms constitute roughly two-thirds of all tokens, in Codex B broken forms dominate. Pipping (1901, 76) notes all five tokens of \pl \ieru in B are found in marginalia: two on 22v, two on 25r, and one on 25v. The second token on 22v is a dittography of the first, which Bilefeld has crossed out, such that ⟨\ieru⟩ essentially amounts to a single token. Pipping (1901, 76) counts ten tokens of \sg \ier: two in the same marginal note on 25r, four in Chapter 24 (§3.1.3), and four elsewhere in the main text. Of these four, two are debatable: in chapter 17 the token \langle\text{saki(r)}⟩ 17v7 ‘cases’ (not found in A) is an error for \text{sak i(e)r} ‘case is’, which could have arisen at any point in the \beta recension, although presumably from an exemplar with unbroken \ier. The token in Chapter 39 originally belonged to the reading nom \sg \text{soydr} ⟨\text{soydir}⟩ 37r8 ‘creature’, which Bilefeld later changed to “soyd ier” [creature-acc is] (“soydr ier” A 31r6; §6.2.2). In addition to the two remaining tokens of \sg \ier \langle\text{er}\rangle 21r3, 41v17 are two tokens \langle\er\rangle 5r13, 47v3, clear Danicisms (§4.3.1).

Despite the low number of unbroken forms in B compared to their frequency in A, four tokens of \sg \ier in B correspond with \ier in A (see Table 5.5): the two tokens in the marginal note on 25v, the first token of chapter 24 (B 23v8), and the token on 41v17. Otherwise, the majority of the 255 tokens are unbroken \ier, \ieru in the older codex and \ier, \ieru in the younger. The younger, broken forms are also found in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, \sg \ier 5 \text{tokens}, \pl \ieru 3 \text{tokens}.

Finally, the \pres subj is always found with the stem-vowel \textit{ē} in Codex A, i.e.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{lcccc}
\hline
 & \text{A ir B \ier} & \text{A \ier B \ier} & \text{A \ier B \ier} & \text{A \ier B \ier} & \text{TOTAL} \\
\hline
\text{TOTAL} & 174 & 74 & 4 & 3 & 255 \\
 & 68% & 29% & 1.6% & 1.2% & 100% \\
\text{sg} & 109 & 71 & 4 & 1 & 185 \\
\text{pl} & 58 & 2 & 2 & 62 \\
\text{sg} & 6 & 1 & 7 & 7 \\
\text{pl} & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Broken and unbroken forms of ‘to be’}
\end{table}

\textsuperscript{16}The token ⟨\text{veri}⟩ A 12v17 for 3 sg \pres subj \ier must be taken as scribal error (perhaps from the \inf), as the subjunctive does not cause \textit{i}-umlaut in Old Gutnish (§4.3.7).
3 SG PRES SUBJ sēi, PL sēin, as well as in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild in the singular: sēi StSC 1, sēy StSC 2. In Codex B the 3 SG PRES SUBJ sēi is only found in five tokens – ⟨sei⟩ 4 tokens, ⟨sey⟩ 35v10 – whereas the majority of tokens contain a stem-vowel ī: 3 SG PRES SUBJ sī ⟨si⟩ 19 tokens. Four tokens of 3 PL PRES SUBJ sēin ⟨sein⟩ occur, outnumbering the single token sīn ⟨siin⟩ 14r16.

Forms with the stem sī- are occasionally found in Old Swedish in the singular, though stems with the lower vowel ē (or ā) dominate (cf. Noreen 1904, 477). However, the high vowel ī is the phonetically regular development from the Proto-Germanic subjunctive stem *sij- (cf. OSw., OGu. vīr PRON ‘we’ < *wīz, *wiz) and should then be considered older than ē (ā). The addition of unstressed -i in the 3 SG sēi, taken analogically from the subjunctive of other conjugations, also suggests a younger form. Kock (1906-29, I, 141) considers the vowel to have been lowered when weak, explaining the variation found in Old Swedish and Old Gutnish. That the lower vowel ē dominates in Old Gutnish may also be due to the homophony of the plural form sīin with 3 PL PRES SUBJ sīin from OGu. sīa ‘to see’. This evidence from Codex B tentatively suggests the stem sē- first began to dominate in the plural, eventually phasing out the stem sī- throughout the paradigm.

5.1.8 þorfa

A single token of OGu. þorfa PRET-PRES VB ‘to need’ inflects with the weak verbal ending -ar in 3 SG PRES ⟨tarfar⟩ 2v10. In Codex A we find the expected ⟨þa|rf⟩ A 3v13 with the same inflection as found in all remaining tokens in both codices. The only token of a 3 PL PRES þorfu ⟨þorfu⟩ A 32v19, ⟨þorfu⟩ B 39v3 also inflects as expected in both codices.[17]

Influence from Danish may be ruled out as an explanation for ⟨tarfar⟩, as ODa. thørve, Da. turde always inflects as a preterite-present (though the stem-vowel varies; see Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, VII, 464-465). OSw. þorva, on the other hand, can occasionally be found with a 3 SG PRES ending taken from the weak inflection, especially in the Middle Swedish period, e.g. thorver, þorver (Noreen 1904, 468). A form Tarffuar, with the same -ar ending as found in Codex B, occurs in a diploma from 1368 (SDHK 2015, no. 9250).

We should not expect Swedish influence in Codex B, however. Instead, the ending -ar in ⟨tarfar⟩ must be a dittography from the following word ārla ⟨arla⟩ 2v10 (the only token of OGu. árla ADV ‘early’ in Codex B).

[17] In a marginal note in Codex B we also find Da. ⟨þorff⟩ 41r.
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Although variation in verbal morphology is found in Codex B, as seen in the preceding section, more general morphological developments are found in the nominal system. The present section investigates a selection of these developments.

5.2.1 Shifts in inflectional class

Shifts from one stem-class to another, or even from one gender to another, is not uncommon in the Old Nordic languages. Despite the small corpus, this can also be found in Old Gutnish.

The expected inflection of the root noun OGu. *brōk* fem ‘trousers’ is with *i*-umlaut in the plural, as found in other Old Nordic forms such as OIcel. *brókr*, OSw., ODa. *bróker*. In Codex B, however, we find **acc pl brōkr** ⟨broker⟩ 22v18 without umlaut, as in Modern Gutnish, Swedish, and Danish, where the umlaut has been analogically removed (Gu., Sw. *broker*; Da. *broge*). Whether the expected form with umlaut was still present at the time of Codex A is not known, as the corresponding token in the older manuscript is **acc sg brōk** ⟨broc⟩ A 20r1.

The twelve tokens **nom-acc pl ertaugr** ⟨ertaug⟩ reflect a root-noun inflection for OGu. *ertaug* fem ‘ørtug (name of a coin)’. In Codex A both a root noun inflection **ertaugr** ⟨ertaug⟩ A 20v1, 38v17-18 and an *ō*-stem inflection **ertaugar** ⟨ertaugar⟩ 7 tokens, ⟨er|taughar⟩ A 28r4-5 are found. The Proto-Germanic origins of OGu. *ertaugar* and its North Germanic cognates (OIcel. *ertog*, ørtug; OSw. *ørtugh*, ortogh) remains a point of debate among scholars; no cognates are known from the other Germanic languages. Common consensus supposes an original *ō*-stem *arut(i)-taugō‑* (cf. *Kroonen 2013*, s.v. ‘arut’; *Hellquist 1957*, s.v. ‘ørtug’; *Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon 1989*, s.v. ‘ørtog’), while the root noun inflection, only known in East Norse (e.g. OSw. *ørtuger*) is considered a secondary development (cf. *Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73*, III, 154-155; *Hansen 2014*, 37).

Originally an *an*-stem, OGu. *brȳþlingi* masc ‘brother’s child’ inflects as a *jan*-stem in the **nom pl brȳþlingiar** (Brylingiar) 40r10 in the younger codex, whereas Codex A maintains the **an-stem nom pl brȳþlingar** (brýplingar) A 33v5-6. *Noreen (1904, 319) explains the insertion of *i* in nouns of this type as an analogical spread of palatal -*ng*- from the **nom sg -ingi**. Although both **nom pl endings** are commonly used interchangeably for the same lexeme in the Old Nordic languages – e.g. OIcel. *skrælingar*, -jar (only **pl** ‘Greenlanders’; OSw. *ervingar*, -iar ‘heirs’ – this use of **nom pl -iar** for ‘brother’s children’ is unique to Old Gutnish; OSw. *brȳþlingi*

18 Note, however, Norw. *brøker*, Elfd. *bryoker*, which still inflect with an unumlauted form.

19 Considering the form is disyllabic, *i*-umlaut is not likely to be expected in the plural. Most root nouns are monosyllables, and while *ertaug* is originally a compound, no root noun simplex *taug* is known.
(var. brøfrungi, brøfringi, bryllyingi, etc.) is only found with NOM PL -ar in the Old Swedish laws.

Two lexemes are found clearly belonging to different stem-classes in the singular, though the forms in Codex B may be due to Danish influence. The a-stem inflection of OGu. dagsverk neut ‘day-labor’, found in the elder codex as ACC SG ⟨dags huerk⟩ A 40v2 and cognate with Old Icelandic. dagsverk, corresponds with a neut n-stem inflection dagsverki in Codex B, ACC SG ⟨dags wercki⟩ 53r3, resembling forms found primarily in East Norse. Similarly, the iā-stem engi neut ‘meadow’ (Old Icelandic. engi) in Codex A, found in the ACC SG ⟨engi⟩ A 4r18, corresponds with an ō-stem eng fem (Old Icelandic. engi) in Codex B, ACC SG ⟨engh⟩ 3v20, 55v5. Both stem-classes are identical in the DAT PL engium, found in the two codices as ⟨engium⟩ A 32r15, ⟨engiom⟩ B 38v13. Influence from older Da. dagsverke ⟨dag-⟩ and eng are the likeliest explanation for the forms found in Codex B; both are further attested in the Danish translation of Guta lag as ⟨dags uercke⟩ D 56v17 and SG ⟨eng⟩ D 6r8, PL ⟨enge⟩ D 40v15.

5.2.2 Deflexion

Occasional loss of inflection, especially following prepositions, is a characteristic feature of Codex B, argues Pipping (1905-07, xcii). An example he cites for this phenomenon is found at the end of the preface of Guta lag:

och wa sy mest tarff at Bade ‘till | liif och siell’ (1bis r12-13)
‘And we may need most in both body and soul’


The phrase “in body and soul” is well known outside of Gutnish, and is not uncommon in Danish diplomas from the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, written almost identically as in Codex B. This entire phrase is best argued to be transferred from Da. til lif og sjæl, rather than an example of deflexion in Old Gutnish.

Otherwise apparent deflexion, including the second example mentioned by Pipping (1905-07, xcii), commonly involves the use of the stem mann- (formally identical with the ACC SG) of Old Icelandic. maþr ‘man’. The stem is found in place of DAT SG mann in four examples – ⟨mand⟩ 8v18 and ⟨man⟩ 22r8 as the object of rykkia

20ONP (2010, s.v. ‘dags-verki’) cites one West Norse example with final -i, found in a Norwegian diploma dated 1347 (DN 1848-1972, V, 192), which reads dagshverki. This may be influence from East Norse, considering the diploma was sent by Magnus Eriksson to the province of Jämtland and was written in Kopparberget (modern-day Falun in Dalarna).

21Read os (§ 5.1.6).

and *nykkia wk vb* ‘to pull (violently)’ (Codex A *nykkia* for both tokens; cf. §5.2.2), ⟨man⟩ 22r5 in the phrase *taka i hár* ‘seize by the hair’, and ⟨man⟩ 45r7 as the indirect object of *giera ōskiel* ‘commit an injustice’. The spelling of the first example shows clear influence from Danish (§4.3.1), which may further explain the loss of dative in these forms.

By contrast, *dat sg mannī* is found only once in Codex B corresponding to the stem *mann-* in the elder codex, a discrepancy which becomes clearer when comparing the German and Danish translations of *Guta lag*:

```
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>at men</th>
<th>schulu ‘mannj helg helda’</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>that men-NOM PL shall man-DAT SG sanctity-ACC AG hold</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
```

‘That men shall maintain personal sanctity.’

Codex A uses a cmpd *mannhelg* fem ‘personal sanctity’, a reading supported by the German translation *manvrede* (an ad hoc creation for the translation; cf. Schmid 2016, 160). Codex B, by contrast, never uses such a compound, but rather writes *mans helg* ‘man’s sanctity’ with gen sg *mans* in the three remaining tokens corresponding with the compound in A. The Danish translation “haffue y helg” D 10v13 [have in sanctity], on the other hand, points to an Old Gutnish original with *helg balda*; the token (*manni*) in Codex B then likely derives from a misreading of two words as one, with an original reading *at menn skulu mann ī helg halda* [That men shall hold (each) individual in sanctity].

Other losses of case-endings may be due to scribal error or Danish interference, such as the loss of nom sg *‑r* in e.g. *nēstr* ⟨nest⟩ 54r10 ‘next’ and *afrāþr* ⟨affrad⟩ 40r4 ‘tribute, tax’, or the missing gen sg *‑s* from e.g. *korns* ⟨korn⟩ 25r17 ‘grain’ and *mans* ⟨mand⟩ 15v11 ‘man’.

The rubric for Chapter 14 reads “*Aff lutuar saker*” 14r5 [Concerning inherited cases] with nom-acc pl fem *lutnar* ‘inherited’ for expected dat * sakum. This confusion of cases is likely taken from the first line of the chapter, which reads “En vm lutuar sakir” 14r6 [But concerning inherited cases] with um prep ‘about, concerning’ governing the ACC PL sakir ‘cases’. The same use of ACC PL sakir found in the table of contents (“Aff lutuar sakir” 55v17) is likely taken from the rubric.

True deflexion or leveling can be found in the plural forms of the weak adjectival inflection, e.g. ⟨sama⟩ 29r3, 39r11 ‘same’ for older ⟨samu⟩ A 25v11, 32v9

---

23 A 1ra8 (in the table of contents), 7v14, 15; B 55v10 (in the table of contents), 8v4, 6.
24 Note also the reading “som allir men haffua i helgh | takit” B 12r2-3 [which all men have taken as sanctuary] (in reference to the churches of Fardhem, Tingssted, and Atlingbo), which is translated in the Danish manuscript as “som alle mendt haffue y helg och | frid tagit” D 12v4-5.
25 Note also the consistent use of ⟨lutuar⟩ for ptc ACC PL fem *lutnar* ‘inherited’ (§3.5.4).
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(modifying DAT PL vitnum ‘evidence’); ⟨nesta⟩ 34r1 ‘next’ for older ⟨nestu⟩ A 29r6 (modifying GEN PL frënda ‘relatives’). The only apparent counterexample is ⟨sama⟩ A 17r8, ⟨samu⟩ B 19v3 ‘same’ (modifying DAT PL vitnum ‘evidence’), although the token in Codex A is found in a provision which has been re-traced by Bilefeld (cf. § 2.3) where the original reading appears to have been ⟨samu⟩. There are, however, examples of -a in the plural common to both codices – GEN PL ⟨sama⟩ A 16v19-20, B 19r14 and DAT PL ⟨sama⟩ A 41v10, B 54v15 – indicating this spread of -a to the plural had already begun by the mid-fourteenth century, as in Old Swedish (see Noreen 1904, 305).

5.2.3 Feminine adjectives and pronouns

Feminine adjectives, participles, and pronouns inflect differently in the two Gutnish codices in the dative and genitive singular. The elder codex preserves the original OGu. DAT SG FEM -ri < PGmc. *-zōi though *r (*ř) assimilates to preceding resonants (other than m) and s as in the other Old Nordic languages (cf. Noreen 1904, 344-345; 1923, 292). By the time Codex B was copied, unassimilated -r- was lost in the DAT SG FEM ending, as found in the following examples:

*alli ‘all’ (Codex A allri with analogically replaced -r): ⟨alli⟩ 48v17. – ⟨ōgutniski ‘(non)-Gotlandic’ (Codex A ⟨ōgutniski⟩): ⟨gutniski⟩ 4 tokens, ⟨gutnisch⟩ 33v13, 56v1, ⟨ogutniski⟩ 28v12, 30v2. – ⟨ōskiptri ‘undivided’ (Codex A ēkiptri): ⟨ō skiptri⟩ 33v5, 36v4. – ⟨rētri ‘right; true’ (Codex A ētri): ⟨rette⟩ 1¹br9 (with double (tt) due to Danish influence; cf. § 4.1.1).

One token is found with -r- in Codex B, DAT SG FEM ainloyptri ⟨einløptri⟩ 28r6 ‘unmarried’.

Loss of -r- in these endings occurred separately in all of the mainland Scandinavian languages. No forms with -r- are known from Danish (see Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, IV, 71-73), while in Swedish -r- and -i are found side by side (see Noreen 1904, 345), though forms with -r- are scarce by the Middle Swedish period. Loss of -r- is evident in Old Norwegian from ca. 1300 (see Noreen 1923, 292). The Insular Nordic languages preserve -r- to the present day: Icel. -ri, Fa. -ari (with secondary insertion of a; cf. Thráinsson et al. 2012, 413). Exactly when -r- was lost in Old Gutnish is unclear, as the DAT SG FEM is not found elsewhere in the corpus, though it seems to have disappeared by the time of the exemplar manuscript β1470.

26 This ending, which originated in the pronominal system, spread analogically to adjectives in Northwest Germanic; cf. Nielsen 1976, 102).

27 The combination *-rr-assimilates into geminate -rr-, as elsewhere in Old Nordic, though *-rk-simplifies to single -r- in DAT SG FEM pairi ‘them’. The only attested example of a stem ending in l is OGu. allr- ‘all’, in which the DAT SG FEM allri analogically replaced -r- as in Old Icelandic, if not a regular retention of -r following geminate ll (see e.g. Noreen 1923, 202).
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The gen sg fem ending in Old Gutnish is unique among the Old Nordic languages, which all have -(r)ar < PGmc. *zōz. This phonetically regular ending is only preserved in OGu. *hennar 'her', otherwise the evidence points to an Old Gutnish ending -(r)ir taken analogically from the dat, e.g. annir 'one' (OIcel. einnar; OSw. ēnnar).

Occasionally the ending appears as -(r)i instead of -(r)ir, as in the following example:

B  ta liaut  son  'teiri tridio' | luto med  then inherits son-nom the-gen third-gen portion-acc pl with  
kinsmen-dat pl

'Then the son of the third (female heir) inherits a portion with his kinsmen.'

In another example of the demonstrative pronoun, gen sg fem þairir in Codex B corresponds with þairi in the elder codex:

B  til 'kirkior  tei|rir',  som  allir men haffua  i helgh  | takit (12r1-2)  
to church-gen that-gen which all men have in sanctuary taken

'To that church, which all men have taken as sanctuary.'

Noreen (1923, 345) interprets the reading þairi in A as a dat sg fem, arguing OGu. til prep 'to' occasionally governs the dat instead of the expected gen; from there, a gen -r would have been added to the dat ending, thus resulting in forms like þairir. However, there is little evidence of til governing anything but the gen in Codex A. Instead, the r-less forms can be explained by their position in the noun phrase, as both examples of þairi immediately precede the substantive. Loss of final -r in this position is paralleled in the fem n-stems, whose gen sg ending -ur occurs as -u in compounds (cf. Säve 1859, xv; Pipping 1905-07, xvii; Noreen 1904, 323), and in the definite article (see § 5.2.4). In another example, an r-less form precedes the substantive in Codex B where Codex A preserves r:

B  ok tu tak atr til  'andri halff Mark' (36v18-19)  

'And you take another half mark'

[consecrated to religious servitude], with loss of final -r from gen -ur, though this may be due to its position in the phrase.
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Pipping (1905-07, xcix) notes the form in B could be interpreted as a dat, though its position before the substantive, together with the clear gen in Codex A, suggests an expected loss of final -r. The contracted form *andri(r)* is regular in Codex B (see §5.1.2).

The possessive pronoun OGu. *sinn, senn* is found once in the gen sg fem, written ⟨sinnar⟩ 12v13 in Codex B, with an ending corresponding to the other Old Nordic languages (e.g. OIcel. *sinnar*). Noreen (1904, 345) considers this reading to be a true gen, as opposed to the hybrid dat-gen reading ⟨sennir⟩ A 11v3 in the elder codex. That the phonetically regular ending -ar would be preserved in this single token alone (apart from OGu. *hemnar* 'her') is unlikely; that Bilefeld writes ⟨a⟩ is more likely due to the influence of other tokens of OGu. *sinn, senn* in the preceding lines: acc pl fem *sīnar* ⟨sinar⟩ 12v8, acc sg fem ⟨dryn-tningina⟩ A 44v2 'the queen', post-vocalic ⟨faroyna⟩ A 44r2 'Fårö', dat sg neut *tos·dahinum* G 70 'Thursday'; dat sg neut *primalinu* CR 15:8 'the golden number', *gildena* StSc 56 'the guild', *arene* (var. *arena*) StSc 66 'the year'. Only two plural forms are attested: nom pl neut *myynān* StSc 41 'the toasts' and gen pl neut *fingranna* CR 15:1 'the fingers'.

Two variants of the gen sg fem are found in Codex B, one with and one without final -r, similar to the variation found in adjectives and pronouns (§5.2.3). Both forms lack final -r in Codex A:

| B | Hwar som seter hus níder vtan | ‘sochninna’ luff (52v8-9) who that sets house down without parish’s-def permission ‘Whoever sets down a house without the parish’s permission’ |

Pipping (1905-07, 40 fn. 3) considers OGu. *balfmark fem* 'half mark (coin)' an indeclinable compound, explaining the lack of the expected gen sg ending in Codex A and thus the expansion given for Codex B. However, no distinct gen sg ending is attested for the simplex *mark fem* 'mark (coin)', despite clear attestations of the form where the syntax would require a gen, suggesting the lexeme was indeclinable in the singular. Another explanation for this lack of a separate gen sg (cf. OIcel. *merkr*) may simply be scribal error in the expansion of this often abbreviated, common lexeme, as the simplex only occurs twice in the gen sg, abbreviated once each in the two Gutnish codices (see also Pipping [1905-07, 46 fn. 3 and 50 fn. 4]).

On dat sg neut *-e(n)ō > -e(n)na* in Old Swedish, see Noreen (1904, 405).
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Table 5.6: Definite article in Codex B. When both are attested, forms of the definite article following a vowel are listed after those following a consonant.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Masc</th>
<th>Fem</th>
<th>Neut</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NOM SG</td>
<td>⟨sonin⟩ 24v1</td>
<td>⟨sochnin⟩ 1.bidv16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨Bondin⟩ 53r11</td>
<td>⟨kunan⟩ 28r17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC SG</td>
<td>⟨gardin⟩ 34v10</td>
<td>⟨schipit⟩ 47v16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>⟨bondan⟩ 53r14</td>
<td>⟨typtit⟩ 46r14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAT SG</td>
<td></td>
<td>⟨sochninnj⟩ 54r3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GEN SG</td>
<td>⟨Bondans⟩ 52v15</td>
<td>⟨sochninna⟩ 52v9,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>⟨sochninnar⟩ 52v12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The reading ⟨socnsinna⟩ A 40r14 in the first example is not a true definite article, but rather the stem of *sōkn* fem ‘parish’ followed by the reflexive *sinn* poss pron, a construction also found in e.g. Upplandslagen in “til sak sinnær” MhB 39 [to his/her case] (Schlyter 1834, 165).

A third token in Codex A contains the gen sg fem ending -innar with final -r. Here the reading in Codex B is corrupt, as also evidenced by the readings in the German and Danish translations, which agree with A:

The corrupted reading *sōkn annar* in B nevertheless traces back to an original def art -innar with final -r, corresponding to the reading in A. This ending is further found in the 1328 runic calendar in *uereiltinnar* CR 16:8.

The examples of OGu. *sōkninna(r)* ‘of the parish’ show that, as in Old Swedish (Wessén 1965, 119; Noreen 1904, 405), the gen sg -ar ending drops before the suffixed article in Old Gutnish. In a token of OGu. *garþr* masc ‘farm’, we find nom

---

32Note, however, the confusion of minims in ⟨sochninnar⟩ A 6v1.
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sg -r has been dropped before the suffixed article in the token *garþin* A 21r7 in the elder codex, which also happens occasionally in the Old Swedish laws (cf. [Noreen 1904, 407]). The corresponding token in B curiously places an extra -r after the article, ⟨garþinr⟩ 25r margin (§ 3.3.1), perhaps analogically from indefinite forms of the masc sg.

In general, the two manuscripts agree in their use of the definite article, though exceptions occur. In the following example, the two codices have reversed which token of OGu. *sōkn* fem ‘parish’ stands in the definite form:

B tha Byti haan iij | marker ‘sochn’, en ‘sochnin’ winder sicht (1v15-16)
then pay she 3 marks parish if parish-def is-able indict
‘Then she pays the parish 3 marks if the parish is able to indict her’

Three examples are found where Codex B has a definite form corresponding with an indefinite in Codex A: NOM sg *barn-it* ⟨barn⟩ A 39v1, ⟨barnit⟩ B 18v8 ‘(the) child’; NOM sg *böndi-n* ⟨bondi⟩ A 40v7, ⟨Bondin⟩ B 53r11 ‘(the) farmer’; ACC sg *øyk-in* ⟨øyk⟩ A 39v1, ⟨øykin⟩ B 51r14 ‘(the) yoke’. In a fourth example, the phrase *sielfs sins* ‘his/her own’ has been reinterpreted as a definite form in Codex B: ⟨sielfs sins⟩ A 38v9-10, ⟨sielffuins⟩ B 50r4. By contrast, only one example is found (apart from the reversal mentioned above), where Codex B has an indefinite form corresponding with a definite in Codex A: DAT sg *sōkn-inni* ⟨sochninn⟩ A 41r7, ⟨sochn⟩ B 54r7 ‘(the) parish’.

In one final example, neither Gutnish codex contains a definite article, though textual evidence suggests there had been in the original text of *Guta lag*:

B Tha en iero gangnir triir winter | ella trim meyra tha schall han hañjua bade kyrkio manna witni, at han thar | mid teym i gjerd warj, oc ‘prester si’ wiñi at han triott haffui thar e sidhan | hanom til fyrd so sum huar annar | kyrkio man. (3v13-17)

‘When three years have passed, or more than three, then he shall have the witness of both the parishioners, that he was with them in the building, and the priest would be a witness, that he has ever since delivered a tithe to him as every other parishioner.’

Although the reading in B (shown in italics) is possible, with *prestr* ‘priest’ as the subject of 3 sg *pres subj* ñ, it does not seem the optimal reading considering the lack of parallelism with gen pl *kyrkiu-manna* ‘of the parishioners’ in the previous

---

33 The only other example of a post-consonantal nom sg masc -in is *sunin* ‘the son’, which lacks final -r the indefinite nom sg *sun* as well. It is thus impossible to determine whether the loss of -r in *garþin* is regular or unique to this form.

34 Read *gangnir*; cf. also § 8.3.6.
phrase. Codex A contains a gen sg of the reflexive pronoun *sinn*, though concord with the preceding *prest* (acc?) is lacking. The reading in the German translation is close to A, complete with concord according to German grammar. Only in the Danish translation, however, do we find two parallel phrases – “bode kirckemends vitne” D 6r4 [both the parishioners’ witness] and “oc prestins vitne” D 6r5 [and the priest’s witness]. This reading must be original, pointing back to an Old Gutnish text with gen sg def *prestins*.

5.2.5 Possessive constructions

Two rubrics in Codex B lack concord in possessive constructions, in which the modifier of the possessor is not marked for gen as expected in Old Gutnish. Both examples are further found in the table of contents on 56v.

The first example is found in the rubric for Chapter 44. No other recension has a new chapter here, meaning the rubric is unique to the β recension.

B Aff Gutnisch mans syni (41r8, 56v11)
of Gutnish-Ø man’s-gen son-dat
‘Concerning a Gotlandic man’s son’

In stark contrast to this lack of concord is the opening line of the same chapter, which reads:

B Engin gutnischs mans son (41r9)
no-nom Gutnish-gen man’s-gen son-nom
‘No Gutnish man’s son’

As there is no reason to doubt the exemplar manuscript β1470 also contained this rubric, we may attribute the lack of gen -s in ⟨Gutnisch⟩ to copy error, either by Bilefeld (if β1470 had *gutnisks*) or earlier in the β recension. The rubric in the table of contents was likely copied from the rubric in the main text, thus also without gen -s.

The second example is found in the rubric for chapter 52, which is also a separate chapter in A and D, though the rubrics differ. Codex B reads as follows:

B Rider tu annan mans hest (44r1, 56v19)
ride-pres thou another-Ø man’s-gen horse-acc
‘If you ride another man’s horse’

Codex A instead has a rubric of the type “Concerning X”, which in the main text reads “af hesti” 36r1 [Concerning a horse], though the table of contents has “Af
The rubric in D has a similar construction as in B, though with a different verb:

D  Thager tu nogen mandz | hest (47v5-6)
   take-3 sg pres you-nom sg some-Ø man’s-gen horse-Ø
   ‘If you take another man’s horse’

This rubric likely derives from the opening sentence of the chapter, which in D reads “Om du tager naagen mandz hest” 47v4 [If you take another man’s horse]. This does not, however, explain the rubric in B, as the chapter opens with the vb *taka* ‘to take’, not *rīþa* ‘to ride’: “Taker tu hest mans” 44r2 [If you take a man’s horse].

Instead, the rubric in the β recension must derive from one the Danish law codes, where provisions regarding riding another man’s horse use the vb *rīthe* ‘to ride’. Chapter 178 of *Skånske lov* (Brøndum-Nielsen and Aakjer 1933, 144), for example, opens with “Riþær man annærs manz hæste” [If a man rides another man’s horse]. The use of gen *anners* (OIcel. *annars*) is expected in such an early Danish text (cf. Perridon 2013, 139), but does not explain the lack of concord in the rubric in Codex B. In *Jyske lov* Book 3, Chapter 54 (Skautrup 1933, 464) we find both an opening sentence and a rubric with the vb *rithe* and, in later manuscripts, an endingless pron *annen* ‘another’. The rubric, here taken from the late-fifteenth-century manuscript Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 8 4to, reads:

JL  Om man ridher an|nen mans hæst (AM 8 4to 41v9-10)
    if man-Ø rides-3 sg pres another-Ø man’s-gen horse-Ø
    ‘If a man rides another man’s horse’

The same rubric is found in the King John’s ordinances for Gotland from 1492, as seen in Bilefeld’s copy in G:

G  Om mand rider anden | mands hest (37v19-20)

The endingless ⟨annan⟩ (formally identical to the acc) in Codex B differs from the Danish tokens only in the unstressed vowel. While one might consider influence from OSw. acc *annan* ‘another’, none of the Swedish laws contain a parallel phrase opening with *rīpha* ‘to ride’. Although the rubric for Chapter 44 in Codex B can be read as Old Gutnish, “Rider tu annan mans hest” can as easily be read as Da. Rider

---

35 It is possible the title *Af hesti* originally belonged to this and the preceding chapter (43) together, in G the two are written as a single chapter under the title “van eyme pferde” 23ra21 [Concerning a horse].

36 Phrases with *taka*, on the other hand, do occur: Östgötalagen “Nu takær man hæst manz rīþær meþ” BB 26 [Now a man takes a(nother) man’s horse and rides with it] (Collin and Schlyter 1839, 214); Bjärköarätten “takær maþ ær manz hæst olowandis” Chapter 9 [A man takes a(nother) man’s horse without permission] (Schlyter 1844, 117); Magnus Eriksson Landslag “Nu taker nakar man
du (en) anden mands best as OGu. Rīþr þū annars mans best. If this rubric was already found in the exemplar manuscript β1470 (ruuling out King John’s ordinances as a possible source, as they were first written two decades later), it must have been introduced by a scribe who was well acquainted with Danish law.

5.3 Discussion

I have argued in the previous chapter that, despite Danish influence on the orthography of Codex B, the morphology remains distinctly Gutnish (cf. especially §4.3.1). Nevertheless, Codex B clearly shows a later stage of the Old Gutnish language than Codex A in the morphology; irregularity in various verbal and nominal paradigms is leveled away, while some endings and other forms are phonologically reduced, resulting in a younger paradigm. That these developments are native Gutnish and not the work of a Danish scribe is at times confirmed by the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, which shows similar developments.

On the other hand, much of the morphological variation in Codex B points to Danish interference rather than native Gutnish developments. At times entire phrases are taken directly from Danish, such as til lif og sjæl [to body and soul] and rider du (en) anden mands best [if you ride another man’s horse]. Transfer from Danish may also best explain items such as dagsverki ‘day-labor’ and eng ‘meadow’, and are perhaps best considered lexical variation, the subject of the following chapter.

\[\text{T}^{\text{J}}\text{B} 38\] [Now a man takes, without loan or borrowing, another man’s horse or beast of burden, and drives, rides, or does some other work with it] \[\text{Schlyter} \ 1862, \ 370\].
Chapter 6

Lexicon

6.1 Extra provisions in Codex B

6.2 Variant readings in B

6.3 Readings clarified in Codex B

6.4 Discussion

Guta lag contains roughly 1200 individual lemmata, ranging from the most common þā ADV ‘then, when’, totaling 634 tokens in Codex B, to hapaxes such as dȳrþ fem ‘honor’, found once in Codex A, and tīa fem ‘toe’, found once in Codex B. As a result of lexical, phrasal, and episodic variation within the corpus of Guta lag, the two Gutnish codices differ in their lexicon. Meanwhile, the preservation of a longer recension in Codex B means the younger manuscript contains numerous lexemes not found elsewhere in the Old Gutnish corpus.

The first section of the present chapter discusses the unique lexical items found only in the provisions missing from Codex A, divided into the chapters in which these provisions are found. A treatment of lexical variants in Codex B follows, divided into four subgroups: (1) Low German loanwords in Codex B, for which Codex A has an inherited lexeme; (2) Other lexical variants, wherein the readings in A and B are etymologically distinct; (3) Derivational variants, wherein the readings in A and B differ in their word-formation, though are etymologically related; and (4) Phonetic variants, wherein the readings in A and B are ultimately the same
lexeme, though the results of different phonetic processes. The chapter concludes with lexical items for which Codex B provides the key for resolving defective readings in Codex A.

6.1 Extra provisions in Codex B

Codex B preserves a longer recension of Guta lag than is found in Codex A (§3.4), and a significant portion of the Old Gutnish lexicon is found in provisions missing in the elder codex. Many of the lexemes only found in Codex B are exactly as we should expect the Old Gutnish form to be when comparing cognates in the other Old Nordic languages; other items show a phonology, word-formation, or semantics unique to Old Gutnish.

All lexical items from these provisions not otherwise attested in Codex A are presented in the following sections. Items which require little discussion, as they appear as expected considering Old Icelandic and/or Old Swedish cognates, are included for the sake of completeness. These items are grouped according to the chapter in which they are found, as they often belong to a similar semantic category due to the nature of the text, such as theft and retribution in Chapter 55. The chapters in which we find unique lexical items are:

Chapter 4 The extra provisions regarding priests and their families are only found in the β recension (§3.1.1).

Chapter 17 The second half of the chapter on unruly animals is likewise unique to the β recension (§3.1.3).

Chapter 19 The lengthy chapter regarding personal wounds shows much variation among the four recensions (§3.1.3); one provision containing a unique lexical item is only found in recension β, another is also found in γ, while a third is found in γ and δ as well.

Chapter 49 The chapter concerning the purchase of slaves is found in all recensions except α (§3.1.7).

Chapter 55 The subchapter regarding theft by slaves is found in β and γ (§3.1.8).

In addition to these chapters, marginal notes from Chapters 19 (§3.1.3) and 26 (§3.1.4) as well as the rubric from Chapter 29 (§3.1.4) contain lexical items not found in Codex A. These are discussed in §6.1.6.

6.1.1 Chapter 4

byrþ fem ‘birth’ (OIcel. byrð, byrðr): acc sg ⟨byrd⟩ 5r7.
6.1. EXTRA PROVISIONS IN CODEX B

The expected Old Gutnish outcome of PGmc. *burði-, OGu. byrþ is also found in the compound at-byrþ fem ‘occurrence’ (OLcel. at-burdō masc) once in each manuscript. This lexeme has fallen together with OGu. byrþ fem ‘burden’ (OLcel. byrðō, byrði) < *burþin-, attested three times each in A and B.

_fram-laþīs_ ADV ‘further’ (OLcel. fram-leiðīs): ⟨framleydis⟩ 5r3.

Use of the adverbial ending -laþīs is not found elsewhere in _Guta lag_, though _Guta saga_ contains the form samu-laþī (read samu-laþīs? cf. OLcel. sṃuleiðīs) ADV ‘likewise’. OGu. _fram_ ADV ‘forth, further’ is well attested in the two codices.

_illr_ ADV ‘ill, evil’ (OLcel. illr): acc sg masc ⟨illan⟩ 5v1.

This is the expected form. The adverbial form _illa_ ADV ‘ill, badly’ is attested twice in _Guta lag_ in both codices, as well as once in _Guta saga_.

_nīþra_ wk vb ‘to lower’ (OLcel. nīðra): 3 sg pres subj ⟨nidrj⟩ 5r7.

In form and meaning this verbal derivative of ADV _nīþr_ ‘down(wards)’ (OLcel. nīðr) aligns with the Old Icelandic cognate. However, the Old Gutnish verb governs the ACC in Chapter 4 of _Guta lag_ in the provision “oc nīðr so Byrd sina” 5r7 [and so lower/defile his birth] as does OSw. _nīþra_, whereas OLcel. _nīðra_ governs the DAT.²

_orrīsta_ fem ‘strife’ (OLcel. orrūsta): dat sg ⟨oristu⟩ 6r12.

The exact etymology of this and related Nordic forms is debated (see e.g. Johannis-son 1950, Asgeir Blöndal Magnússon 1989, s.v. ‘orrūsta’), and great variation exists in the ending, e.g. OLcel. -ūsta, -ista, -asta, -osta, etc. The Old Gutnish ending -ista is reminiscent of _piānista_ ‘service’, a loan from Low German.

Regarding the first vowel, it is unclear whether *u > o occurred before geminate _rr_ (cf. Gustavson 1940, 162-164), further complicating the form. Foreign influence cannot be ruled out, though the details remain unclear.

_verra_ comp adv ‘worse’ (OLcel. _verr̥_): ⟨werra⟩ 5r7.

[Jacobsen (1910, 33 fn. 4) considers the reading “at han taki i | werra” 5r6-7 [that he takes in worse (i.e. marries beneath his status)] defective; unfortunately, no other recension preserves this provision to clarify the reading. The use of a disyllabic _verra_ for the ADV ver is indeed unexpected, especially considering the monosyllabic

---

¹Cf. “at nīþra alla indye lanz guþa” [to destroy all the gods of India] in the Old Swedish _Legendarium_ (Stephen 1847, 204).

²Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874, s.v. ‘nīðra’) notes a single instance of OLcel. nīðra governing ACC in Stjórn (Unger 1862, 67). In the passage in question, however, _nīðra_ is followed by _neiþa_ ‘to shame, disgrace’, which governs the ACC: “Niðrum þa ok neiþum þeira tungur” Gn 11:7 (Astæus 2003, 99) [Let us humiliate and shame their tongues], thus determining the case of the object.
ver is attested in Codex B (§6.1.4). Leveling from the adjectival form verri may provide one solution (cf. the adverbial use of Da. verre ADJ), though this does not satisfactorily explain the final vowel, which would have been -i, -a, and -u in the strong adjective. Instead, disyllabic verra must have been formed on analogy with adjective-adverb pairs such as illr-illa ‘ill, bad(ly)’.

### 6.1.2 Chapter 17

**ō-goymsla** FEM ‘negligence’ (Olcel. van-geymsla): dat sg ⟨ogømslu⟩ 17v6.

Schlyter (1877) gives the headword of this hapax as ogömsla, noting further “af göma; Isl. úgeymsla”. Pipping (1905-07), on the other hand, proposes a more Gutnish form o goymsla. Both interpretations assume the privative prefix ō- on an otherwise unattested substantive, corresponding with Olcel. geymsla ‘care, guardianship’, which in turn derives from the verb geyma ‘to keep, heed, guard’. While in Modern Gutnish no substantive †(o)gáimslá exists, the corresponding verb gáimä (Sw. gömma) does occur.

Interpreting the ⟨o⟩ in ⟨ogømslu⟩ as the privative prefix ō- is not unproblematic, however. Pace Schlyter, Olcel. †úgeymsla (or †úgeymsla) does not seem to exist. Instead, the corresponding Icelandic form must be vangeymsla ‘negligence’, which also occurs in Old Swedish legal prose as vangömsla. The privative prefix ō- does occur in the Faroese in the substantive ógoymsla in the proverb “ógoymsla ger so mangan tjóv” (Hammershaimb 1891, I, 219) [negligence makes many thieves]; however, this need not show an archaic form, as the prefix ō- is productive in Faroese. If not a defective reading for vangoymsla, the Old Gutnish form may likewise show the spread of the privative suffix ō-.

**vara** vb ‘to warn’ (Olcel. vara): ptc nom sg masc ⟨warad e⟩ 17v4.

This is the expected Gutnish form. Due to the lowering of uer > uar (§4.3.8), the inf vara ‘to warn’ would have become indistinguishable from vera, vara vb ‘to be’.

### 6.1.3 Chapter 19

**gang-femni** FEM ‘ability to walk’: dat sg ⟨gangfempi⟩ 20r18.

**run-femni** FEM ‘ability to run’: ⟨runfempi⟩ 20r19.

Säve (1852, xxvii) connects the element -femni ‘ability’ with Olcel. -fimni (var. -fimi) FEM ‘deftness, ability’, an interpretation which has subsequently been accepted by Wadstein (1894-95, 2) — who further notes the use of epenthetic p to be a feature of the younger manuscript (§4.1.4) — and more recently by Heidermanns (1993, 197).

---

3 Only nom sg masc verri is attested.
As in Old Icelandic, the first member of compounds with -femni are nouns, in the above cases deverbals from OGu. ganga 'to walk, to go' and *renna 'to run' (Gu. ränna). The use of OGu. run in the same sense as En. run is striking, considering OIcel. runi masc means 'course (of liquid), flow'. Both meanings are found in Goth. runs masc. A possible Old Swedish cognate run fem 'run' can be found in Sturekrönikan (Söderwall 1884-1918, s.v. 'run?') in a line reading “ryzer them fölgher mz rwnar snara” (Klemming 1867-68, 135 line 3931) [the Russians hastily follow them with running]. As in English (Onions et al. 1996, s.v. 'run'), the vocalism in OGu. run is based on the PTC of *renna.


This is the expected form, as Old Gutnish always preserves k in the ending -likr (OIcel. -ligr, -legr; OSw. -liker, -ligher; cf. Noreen 1904, 208; 1923, 184).

thía fem 'toe' (OIcel. thål): nom sg (Thia) 20v3.

The length of the vowel i is confirmed by Gu. tāiā, which I have previously argued (Vrieland 2015) to be the regular outcome of PGmc. *-aihw-.

6.1.4 Chapter 49

aldr masc 'time, age' (OIcel. aldr): acc sg ⟨alder⟩ 43r10.

As noted in §4.2.5, Bilefeld is far less likely to indicate the svarabhakti vowel with ⟨e⟩ than with ⟨i⟩ or an er-tittle. The use of ⟨e⟩ in aldr is likely due to influence from (O)Da. alder.

betr comp adv 'better' (OIcel. betr): ⟨Beter⟩ 42v16.

This is the expected Old Gutnish form. The corresponding adj *betri (OIcel. betri) is not attested. See also ver below.

beþ-royta fem 'bedwetting' (lit. 'bed-rotting'). dat sg ⟨Bedroytu⟩ 43r6.

This compound is not known outside of Gutnish, although the formation is clearly beþ neut 'bed' + royta fem 'rot(ting)', while the definition 'bedwetting' is made clear by the German translation “vndir pissent” G 22vb13 [wetting oneself]. Neither simplex is known elsewhere in Old Gutnish, though both survive as Gu. bädd (possibly influenced by Sw. bädde) and ræte, -å.

4Used three times in Wulfila’s translation: runs ‘course, race’ for Gk. δρόμος (II Tm 4:7); run gawarkjan ‘to run violently’ for ὁμάω (Mt 8:32); runs blōþis ‘issue of blood’ for ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος (Lk 8:44).

5Note, however, the lack of concord between nom pl ryzer 'Russians' and 3 sg pres følgher ‘follows’.
brut-fall neut ‘epilepsy’ (OICel. brot-fall): dat sg ⟨Brutfalli⟩ 43r6.

This is the expected form. The first member of the compound is the same etymon as OGu. bort adv ‘away’, though lacks metathesis of ru and thus preserves the original u-vocalism, whereas bort shows both a metathesis of *ru > *ur and a subsequent lowering of *u > o before r + consonant (Wessén 1965, 14).

for-máli masc ‘stipulation’ (OICel. for-máli): acc sg ⟨for mala⟩ 43r2, dat ⟨formala⟩ 42v14.

This lexeme is not otherwise known in East Norse.

gietas str dep vb ‘to please, to satisfy’ (OICel. geta): 3 sg pres ⟨gies⟩ 42v12, pret ⟨gatis⟩ 42v16, 19.

This verb is a deponent formation of OGu. gieta str vb ‘to be able’ (OICel. geta), found in Guta saga as 3 pl pret ⟨gātu⟩ A 44r3, 6, 49v17.

baimul adj ‘legitimate’ (OICel. heimill): acc sg masc ⟨heimulan⟩ 43r13.

Variation between a front and back vowel in the second syllable is found in Old Icelandic (heimill, -ull, -all), though the front vowel i dominates. In Old Swedish legal language, only a back vowel is found (OSw. hēmul, -ol). The back vowel u in Old Gutnish is thus expected, especially if this etymon is to be connected with Got. haim-ōþli masc ‘property’ (thus e.g. Ásgeir Blöndal Magnusson 1989, s.v. ‘heimill, heimull, †heimall).

† heldi neut ‘possession, custody’: dat sg ⟨heldi⟩ 43r11.

This token occurs in a provision which begins “Ta en han ward brigder i | heldi” 43r10-11 [If he (the slave) is reclaimed while in (your) possession], for which the Danish translation reads “y | hende” D 46v2-3 [in (your) hands]. While it is possible the translator misread or re-interpreted an exemplar with † heldi, such a formation in Old Gutnish is problematic. Pipping (1905-07, s.v. ‘heldi’) points out a connection between † heldi and upp-heldi neut ‘maintenance’ (OICel. upp-heldi), yet the latter is a compound of the type at-mēli neut ‘year’, whose second member is a ja-stem derivative of the thematic noun māl neut ‘speech, case; period of time’. Likewise, the second member of OICel. upp-heldi derives from the thematic noun bald neut ‘possession, custody’; no independent lexeme † heldi exists in Icelandic, nor should we posit one for Gutnish. Ekwall (1904, 51) notes the presence of Norw. helde neut in dialects, “[v]el lösgjordt ur sammansättingar” [doubtless taken from compounds], which could provide a parallel for OGu. † heldi; on the other hand, in modern Gotlandic we only find bald neut (further generalized in compounds, e.g. upphald), which must be a direct descendant of OGu. *bald, considering the preservation of unrounded a (cf. the loan håll from Sw. håll).
Neither should we posit dat sg (heldi) as an example of i-umlaut in an OGu. neut *bald, as i-umlaut is otherwise not found in thematic nouns in Gutnish. The token is thus best interpreted as a scribal error for dat sg hendi ‘hand’, corresponding with the reading in D.

*būta* vb ‘to call (upon)’: 2 sg pres subj ⟨huti⟩ 43r11.

Schlyter ([1877], s.v. ‘huta’) considers this a defective reading for impv haiti ‘call’, a reading later rejected by Pipping ([1901], 87f.), who notes the imperative of OGu. haita should be *hait. Pipping instead connects the verb to Sw. *huta (åt) ‘scold, berate’, Norw. *huta ‘shout; command [a dog]’, further proposing an original Nordic meaning ‘call, shout out’ as found in the Finnish loan *huutaa. This interpretation of ⟨huti⟩ as a subjunctive is undoubtedly correct, despite the lack of final -r expected for the 2 sg; a similar instance is found in 2 sg pres subj ⟨Byti⟩ 23r2.

*nīpan* fem of neut (?) ‘waning (of the moon)’: acc sg ⟨niðan⟩ 43r7.

The phrase “om ny oc nidan” 43r7 [for the waxing and waning, for a month] is also found in *Guta saga*, though as “vm | ny oc niþar” A 44r11-12, with acc pl niþar from OGu. nīþ ‘waning’. It is possible ⟨nidan⟩ in Codex B is a misreading of niþar, as the confusion of ⟨n⟩ and ⟨r⟩ is found elsewhere in the manuscript. If this is the case, the defective reading may have been early in the manuscript tradition, as the Danish translation has “om ny oc neden” D 46r16 rather than a more common Da. *næ(de) (ODa. *næthe*, though forms with -r occur as well). Otherwise, *nīpan* may be a separate lexeme (cf. *nedan* and the obsolete *ned*).

*siauandi* ord ‘seventh’ (OIcel. *sjaundi*): acc sg masc ⟨siauanda⟩ 42v11.

The extra vowel in the suffix -andi, which must be analogical from the higher ordinal numbers, is still present in Gu. *siauende*.

*ūt-liþin* ptc ‘past, expired’ (OSw. *ūt-liþin*): nom sg fem ⟨wt lidin⟩ 43r1.

Derived from *ūt* prep ‘out’ (OIcel. *ūt*) plus *liþa* vb ‘to endure, suffer; to last’ (OIcel. *līða*), both of which are otherwise known in *Guta lag*, this form is not found in Icelandic, which instead has forlīðinn (cf. Sw. *förleden*, Da. *forleden*).

*ver* comp adv ‘worse’ (OIcel. *verr*): ⟨wer⟩ 42v16, ⟨werra⟩ 5r7.

This is the expected form. An unexpected disyllabic form *verra* is also attested in Codex B (§6.1.1). See also betr above.

---

6 On a parallel of this motif in Irish literature, see Mills (2015).
7 Cf. *þegar* (tegan) 26v19 ‘then’, nom sg venzl ⟨werzl⟩ 4v7 ‘suspicion’.
8 See also Brøndum-Nielsen [1928-73], IV, 241-242 and references on Da. syvende ‘seventh’, OIcel. *āttundi* ‘eighth’, etc.
verkia vb 'to ache' (OIcel. verkja): 3 sg pres ⟨werkir⟩ 43r8.

While the Old Gutnish form is identical with the Old Icelandic, it has notably avoided the lowering of -u̯er‑ > -u̯ar‑ (§4.3.8).

6.1.5 Chapter 55

ā-gripr masc 'stolen goods' (OSw. ā-griper): nom sg ⟨agripir⟩ 46v13.

gripir masc pl 'valuables' (OIcel. gripir): acc ⟨gripi⟩ 47v12, 13, 17.

These are the expected forms. The compound āgripr is not known in Icelandic, though the simplex gripir masc 'possession, valuable' and compound āgrip neut 'size' derive from the same basic verb gripa str vb 'to grab; to seize' (not attested in Old Gutnish). Note also the use of OGu. gripir masc 'grabbing' (etymologically the same as gripir masc pl 'valuables') in chapter 32 in both codices.

alls adv 'at all' (OSw. alls): ⟨als⟩ 46v11.

The formation of adverbs via gen -s is also found in framlaiþis 'further' (§6.1.1) and oloyfis 'without leave, not permitted'. In Icelandic alls- is commonly found as a prefix (alls-konar adv 'all kinds of', alls-staðar adv 'everywhere'), found in OGu. alls-valdandi (A) and alls-valdugr (B) adj 'almighty' (§6.2.1). The use of a simplex alls adv 'at all' is common in Modern Swedish.

bain-hail adj 'undamaged in the bones': dat sg masc ⟨Bain heilom⟩ 46v9.

brust-hail adj 'undamaged in the breast; breathing (metaph. alive)': dat sg masc ⟨Brustheilom⟩ 46v10.

Compounds consisting of a body-part term (stem or gen) plus heill adj 'whole' in the meaning 'having good X' are known from Old Icelandic, e.g. augna-heill 'having good eyesight' and brjóst-heill 'having good lungs'. The use of ⟨u⟩ in OGu. brust-hail is unexpected considering the Old Icelandic parallel with brjóst neut 'breast' = OGu. briaust. A possible explanation is that ⟨u⟩ is a misreading of ⟨y⟩ (cf. §4.3.7), and that the form should read brjöst-hail, with brjöst- as an unumlauted variant of briaust (cf. OIcel. hard-brýstr 'hard-hearted'). However, Icelandic compounds with heill do not have unumlauted forms as the first member, cf. fót-heill 'having good legs' vs. ber-fót 'barefoot'. The Gutnish form could likewise have been influenced by mainland forms, e.g. Da. bryst or Sw. bröst (OSw. brjóst) or from MLG brust; otherwise the form may show Old Gutnish preserved a reflex of PGmc. *brust- (Goth. brusts, *brust-).
6.1. EXTRA PROVISIONS IN CODEX B

MLG *brust*, the zero-grade of *breusta- (OIcel. *brjóst*, OE *brēost*). Such explanations are equally unconvincing as OGu. *briaust* is otherwise attested, as well as the regular modern reflex Gu. *braust*.

**baug-band** neut ‘handcuff’: acc pl ⟨baug band⟩ 46v16.

The simplex *baugr* masc is known from Guta saga in the skaldic line “alt ir baugum bundit” A 43r16 “Everything is bound with rings” Its use in the meaning ‘arm’ or ‘wrist’ is unparalleled in other Old Nordic languages, though it is also found in the compound *baug-liþr* masc ‘wrist’ (cf. OIcel. *ulf-liðr* < *ǫln-liðr*, Da. *hånd-led*). OGu. *band* neut ‘band’ is otherwise known as a simplex and in other compounds, e.g. *silkis-band* neut ‘silk band’.

**fluti** masc ‘small boat’ (OIcel. *floti*): dat sg ⟨fluta⟩ 47v7.

This is the expected form. The related substantive *flut* neut ‘floating’ (OIcel. *flo* is attested in the elder codex as dat sg ⟨fluti⟩ A 39v8. Bilefeld appears to have confused these two lexemes, as he has changed the latter from an original ⟨fluti⟩ 51v5 to ⟨fluta⟩, resulting in the reading “hittir mader a fluta | vtj” 51v5-6 [If someone finds (a shipwreck) out on a small boat] in contrast to the reading “hittir han a flutj vtj” A 39v8 [if he finds (a shipwreck) out afloat] in the elder codex. The two lexemes are kept distinct in the German translation, which has “czu schiffé” G 25rb22 [by ship] for OGu. *fluta* ‘on a small boat’ and “an dem vlosse” G 28rb7 [floating] for OGu. *flutj* ‘afloat’.

**fresta** vb ‘to torment’ (cf. OIcel. *freista*): 3 sg pres subj ⟨fresti⟩ 46v8, ptc gen sg masc ⟨o|fresta⟩ 46v14-15.

A connection with OIcel. *freista* wk vb ‘to try, attempt; to tempt’, OSw. *fresta* is only possible if the short e in the Old Gutnish form arose via contraction of PGmc. *ai* in front of the consonant cluster *st* as found in e.g. OGu., OIcel. *flestr* superl adj ‘most’ (see e.g. Noreen [1904], 77; Gustavson [1940], 211). The only example of *ai* preserved before *st* in the manuscript corpus is the place-name *Aistland* ‘Estonia’ (Icel. *Eistland*). A few examples are found in the modern language, e.g. *aist* masc ‘Estonian [from Ösel]’, *gnaiste* vb ‘to spark’ (OIcel. *gneista*); otherwise, a monophthong is found, e.g. *mest* comp adj and adv ‘most’.

**fundar-laun** neut pl or fem sg ‘finder’s reward’ (Icel. *fundar-laun*): acc ⟨funder⟩ 47r15.

10 Loss of *i* after *r* and *l* is regular (Gu. *braute* ‘to break’ < *briauta*, *draugar* ‘lasting’ < *driaugr*, *flauge* ‘to fly’ < *fliauga*) a similar development also known from Faroese (*bróst*, *bróta*, *drúgva*, *flúgva*).

11 See Blomkvist and Jackson [1993].

12 Cleasby and Vigfusson (1874, s.v. ‘fundr’) list OIcel. *fundar-laun*, though give no examples, nor do there seem to be any from Old Icelandic or Old Norwegian. In Old Swedish, we do find *fynde lön* in Södermannalagen (Schlyter [1838], 121).
The use of the er-tittle in gen sg fundar ‘finding’ is unexpected in this token, as Bilefeld typically uses the abbreviation for weak i or the svarabhakti vowel (§ 4.2.5); this should not, however, be used as evidence for an original gen sg **‑ir for i-stems (as argued by e.g. Noreen [1923], 270 on the basis of OIcel. † overger ‘nothing’ in the Icelandic Homily Book, a claim rejected in Vrieland [2016], 229). No hard evidence for gen sg **‑ir can be found, while loss of a in the ending -ar due to a scribal slip is found in e.g. 3 sg pres kallar ⟨callr⟩ A 3r17 in the elder codex and an erroneous addition of (a) is found in acc pl markr ⟨markar⟩ 27r15 in B.

Both simplexes fundr, fyndr masc ‘finding’ and laun neut pl or fem sg ‘reward’ are otherwise attested in Old Gutnish.

bún masc ‘latch’ (OIcel. bím ‘bar, beam’): nom sg ⟨hun⟩ 46v7.

bél masc ‘lock’ (OIcel. hál ‘peg’): nom sg ⟨hell⟩ 46v7.

Peel (2015, 197 note Addition 8/11) surveys previous scholars’ translations of the alliterative phrase “hun ella hell” found on 46v7, which range from “ofvantic eller vid grunden” (Schlyter [1852], 110) [above or at the ground] to “bom [eller] hângsla” (Wadstein [1890-92], 229) [beam or hinge]. The latter interpretation is to be preferred (thus also Jacobsen [1910], 99 fn. 4). Wadstein ([1890-92], 229) connects OGu. bún with OIcel. bím ‘bar, beam’, assuming the Gutnish form to indicate a latch beam, and the alliterating hél with Sw. (Norrland dialect) hál ‘pin’. Neogaard includes the latter Gutnish form in his 1732 word-list as hel or hâld in the same meaning (cf. Wollin [2009], 229).

buru adv ‘how’ (Sw. buru): ⟨huru⟩ 46v3.

The exact formation parallels Sw. buru, likely a shortening of *hvar(n) veg ‘(in) which way’ (Icel. hvernig; cf. Hellquist [1957], s.v. ‘huru, hur’, Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon [1989], s.v. ‘hvernig, †hvernug’). The related adverb bur ‘where’ (Sw. hur ‘how; where’) is attestd in both codices.

ieta vb ‘to eat’ (OIcel. etā): ptc nom sg neut ⟨ietit⟩ 47v3.

Breaking in this lexeme is also known from Dalecarlian, e.g. Elfd. jätä, Orsa jätä (as opposed to lengthening as found in Icel. éta, Far. ēta); see § 4.2.3.

laup-stigr masc ‘getaway, flight’ (OIcel. blaup-stigr): dat sg ⟨laupstighi⟩ 47r17.

This is the expected form. The simplex laupa vb ‘to run’ (OIcel. blaupa) is otherwise attested in Old Gutnish; *stigr masc ‘path’ (OIcel. stigr) is not attested as a simplex, though the related stig neut ‘step’ is.

skuþa vb ‘investigate’ (OIcel. skóða): inf ⟨schu|da⟩ 48r7-8.

This is the expected Old Gutnish form and survives as Gu. skudá.
6.1. EXTRA PROVISIONS IN CODEX B

**skyldr** **adj** ‘guilty’ (OIcel. skyldr): nom sg masc ⟨schyld*r⟩ 48r9, ⟨schulder⟩ 48r13, ⟨oschyld*r⟩ ‘not guilty’ 48r10, 14.

Forms with ⟨y⟩ are the expected forms; on the use of ⟨u⟩, see §4.3.7.

**vibr-lag** neutr pl ‘compensation’ (OIcel. viðr-logged): acc ⟨wider | lagh⟩ 46v8-9, ⟨wider lagh⟩ 46v14.

This is the expected form. Both **vibr** prep ‘with, by’ and **lag** neutr pl ‘law, condition’ are otherwise well attested.

**þiauf-napr** masc ‘theft; stolen goods’ (OIcel. þjóf-nádr). Nom sg ⟨tiauffnader⟩ 46v1, 47r8, acc sg def ⟨tiauffnadin⟩ 46v2.

**þypht** fem ‘theft’ (OIcel. þyþô). Acc sg ⟨typt⟩ 47r1.

**þyphti** neut ‘stolen goods’ (OIcel. þýfti). Nom sg ⟨typti⟩ 46r14, 17, acc sg ⟨typti⟩ 47r14, def ⟨typtit⟩ 46r13, 47r7, 10, dat sg ⟨typti⟩ 46r13, 20, 47r13.

All three lexemes derive from **þiaufr** masc ‘thief’ and are similar to Old Swedish in their word-formation. The suffix -napr (OIcel. -nádr, OSw. -napør) is otherwise found in OGu. matnapr masc ‘foodstuffs’ and varnapr masc ‘guard, custody’; in the case of **þiaufnapr** the consonant cluster -fn- has not assimilated to -m(p)n- as is typical of Codex B (§4.1.6), the only other exception being 3 sg pres subj ⟨stefni⟩ 41v6 ‘summon’. It is possible **þiauf-napr** continued to be analyzed as two separate morphemes, thus avoiding this assimilation.\(^{13}\)

The same cannot be said of **þypt** and **þyphti**, which show the occlusion of *-*fþ (from root-final *-b [β] plus the PGmc. suffix *-iþô > *-ft as in OSw. þiðft, -ý- fem ‘theft’, with subsequent assimilation to -pt (Old Swedish forms with -pt are also found). Similarities with Old Swedish are even more evident in **þyphti**, which shows the same word-formation as OSw. þiðft, -ý- neut ‘stolen goods’, based on the stem of **þypht** < *þeub-iþô- rather than directly from **þiaufr** < *þeuba- as in OIcel. þýfi < *þeub-ija-.

**þrí-gildi** neutr ‘fine worth three times the value of stolen goods’ (cf. OIcel. þrí-gilda wk vb ‘to pay threefold’).

The exact compound *þrigildi* is not known in Old Icelandic, although the related verb þrigilda wk vb ‘to pay threefold’ is found. Otherwise, compounds with the elements þrí ‘three; thrice’ and gildi neutr ‘payment, tribute’ are common, e.g. þrí-faldr adj ‘threefold’ and skattgildi neutr ‘tax’. In Old Gutnish we also find þrisuar, -ý- adv ‘thrice’ and þiaufgildi neutr ‘payment for theft’, while a West Germanic cognate of gildi is found in the loanword vereldi neutr ‘werekild’ (see also §1.3.1).

---

\(^{13}\) Noreen (1904, 194) notes the assimilated form þiūmnaþer in Codex Bureanus.

\(^{14}\) Rounding of i > ý is due to the labial glide in the following syllable.
6.1.6 Marginalia and Rubrics

\textit{arm-legg} masc ‘forearm’ (OIcel. \textit{arm-legg}r): NOM SG \langle armlegg \rangle 21v margin.

\textit{legg-bain} neut ‘shinbone’ (OSw. \textit{legg-bēn}): NOM SG \langle legbain \rangle 21v margin.

Both compounds are the expected forms considering cognates in the other Old Nordic languages. No simplex *\textit{armr} masc ‘arm’ (OIcel. \textit{armr}, Gu. \textit{arm}) is attested, though both \textit{legg} masc ‘leg’ and \textit{bain} neut ‘bone’ are found.

\textit{burna} fem ‘daughter’: DAT PL (\textit{Burnum}) 25r margin.

Although Pipping (1905-07, s.v. ‘burin? *burn?’) is unable to interpret the form, Jansson (1935-36, 10-13) notes the meaning ‘daughter’ is clear from the German manuscript, which reads “myt den tochteren” G 13rb10 [with the daughters]; cf. also Holmåk and Wessén (1979b, 267 note 23). Originally a weak inflection of the PTC \textit{burin} ‘born’ (OGu. \textit{bera} ‘to bear’), this substantive is also found on runic inscriptions, e.g. NOM SG \textit{burna} G 33, ACC SG \textit{burnu} G 36 (see also Snædal 2002, 197 et passim). The lack of lowering \textit{*u} > \textit{o} before \textit{r} plus consonant is due to the preceding labial, cf. \textit{burg} fem ‘fortress’ (Gustavson 1940, 123).

Derivations from PGmc. \textit{*beran} with the meaning ‘child, progeny’ are known elsewhere in Germanic, e.g. Goth., OIcel., OGu. \textit{barn} neut ‘child’ < \textit{*barna}- and Goth. \textit{baur}, OIcel. \textit{burr}, OE \textit{byre}, all masc ‘son’ < \textit{*buri}-, However, the use of the PTC \textit{*buran}- in the meaning ‘daughter’ is unique to Gutnish.

\textit{in-tekt} fem ‘taking in (with a woman)’: DAT SG \langle inchte \rangle 28r4, 56r14.

This form is found in the rubric for Chapter 29, which is unlabeled in the elder codex. Bilefeld has also added \langle Intect \rangle G 14vb28 at the beginning of the corresponding chapter in the German manuscript, while the Danish translation contains the rubric “Af inteckt” D 30r6, using the Gutnish word. An entry for the chapter in the table of contents in Codex A reads “Af mannj vir. intak|titu|num” A 1rb5-4, which Pipping (1905-07, 1 fn. 8) contends should be read \textit{af manni innitaknum} [concerning a man taken in].

OGu. \textit{intekt} derives from OGu. \textit{inn(i)} prep ‘in(side)’ + \textit{taka} STR VB ‘to take’, otherwise found together in the PTC \textit{inni-takin} in the same chapter (and the table of contents in A). Cognates from other Nordic languages, including OIcel. \textit{intekt}, -\textit{tekð}, OSw. \textit{intekt} (Sw. \textit{intäkt}), Da. \textit{indtægt} all mean ‘income’ rather than refer to a man being caught in a woman’s bed. Yet the rubric in the Danish manuscript

\textsuperscript{15}Jacobsen (1910, 70 fn. 5) considers the form in the Danish manuscript to be “et Ord, der er dannet i Overensstemmelse med det Gullandske ‘tage inde’ (taka inni)” [a word created in compliance with the Gutnish ‘take in’ (taka inni)], giving no mention of the Gutnish forms found in Codices B and G.
6.2. VARIANT READINGS IN B

indicates the use of this lexeme in reference to adultery was also present in the δ recension.

The simplex tekt fem ‘taking’ is also attested in Old Gutnish, though only in Codex A, in the title “Af hesta tect” A 1va10 [Concerning the taking of horses] in the table of contents.

6.2 Variants readings in B

Lexical variation between Codices A and B frequently results in items from the Old Gutnish vocabulary only being attested in the younger manuscript. Often it is clear that the reading in Codex A is closer to the original text, though this is not always the case. Lexical variation does not always consist of two completely unrelated words; often the variant found in Codex B derives from the same etymon as the variant in Codex A but is the product of a different word-formation or a different phonetic development. The following sections examines these lexical items unique to Codex B.

6.2.1 Loanwords in Codex B

Contact between the Nordic region and its southern neighbors long predates the codification of Guta lag, yet over time this contact between Gotland, Denmark, and Sweden on one side and Northern Germany on the other changed in both intensity and character. While cultural borrowing from south to north can be traced back to the Viking Age (800-1150), a shift took place during the mid-thirteenth century, at which point Scandinavian society became inundated with German traders, craftsmen, and nobility, with the Nordic languages equally flooded with borrowings from these migrants’ language, Low German.16 This increasing influence from Low German, even in the basic vocabulary and structure of the Nordic languages, is evident in the lexicon of Codex B as well.


Cognates of both Gutnish lexemes can be found across the Old Nordic languages, e.g. OSw. alzvaldogher, alzvaldande and OIcel. allsvoldugr, allsvoldandi, the latter being found as variant readings in e.g. Ólafs saga Tryggvasonar (ONP 2010, s.v. ‘allsvoldugr’). While the first member of the compound alls- ‘all’ is native to North

---

16Engelbrecht (1993, 48-49) divides contact with Germany into four periods: the cultural borrowings of the Viking Age (800-1150), increased trade during the early Hansa period (1150-1250), settlement during the later Hansa period (1250-1500), and regional differentiation around the Reformation (1500-1530).
Germanic, the second member -valdugr (-völdugr) is either loaned from or influenced by MLG woldich (Veturliði Óskarsson 2003: 211-212; Ásgeir Blöndal Magnússon 1989, s.v. ‘völdug(u)r’ and ‘völdugur’). The corresponding form found in Codex A with the native element allsvaldandi may nevertheless be a calque of the German formation.

berykta wk vb ‘to spread rumors, slander’ < MLG beruchten (OSw. berykta): 3 pl pret (beryochtado) 1bisv12. Codex A vīta wk vb ‘to charge (with a fine)’ (OIcel. vīta): 3 sg pres (vitr) 2v13.

These variants are found in the following provision:

B  tha haffui haan sinar triar marker af thérn som hana ‘berychtado’ (1bisv12) 
‘Then she has her three marks from them who slandered her’

Which is shown with the token B 4r2. As is common in the Danish translation, the concept is rendered in D with a doublet berygte and vide, corresponding with both lexemes found in the two Gutnish manuscripts. The order of such doublets in D gives no indication of what the exemplar manuscript had — cf. “for|spilt oc forkomit” D 3v11-12 [wasted and spoiled] for spilt A 2v5, B 1v5 ‘wasted, destroyed’ and “reen oc skir” D 3v20 [clean and clear] for skir A 2v12, B 1v11 ‘clean; guiltless’ — making it impossible to determine with certainty whether the translation derives from an Old Gutnish original with vīta, as in A, or berykta, as in B. On the other hand, considering berykta and vīta are not full synonyms, it is possible the Danish translation derives from a recension with both lexemes.

Neither Schilder (1818, 2) nor Schlyter (1852, 114) were able to read the token in G, as the text on 1r is worn. I read the token as ⟨vor⸌r⸍echet⟩, a scribal error for verrechtet ‘testifies, convicts’, which would suggest an exemplar with OGu. vīta.

Both translations notably make use of a singular in the relative clause (D “aff then” 4r2 is sg), corresponding with the reading in A.

betala wk vb ‘to pay’ < MLG betalen (OSw. betala): 1nf (betala) 54r15. Codex A gielda str vb ‘id.’ (OIcel. gialda): 3 sg pres (gieldr) 42v17.

Though betala is today the most common word for ‘to pay’ in the Nordic languages, the loanword first begins to appear in diplomatics around the turn of the fifteenth century. The earliest certain examples are an Old Swedish testament from

17 Icel. betala, bítala is considered old-fashioned (Mörður Árnason 2007), the more common words being borga or greiða. In Faroese betala can be heard in the spoken language, while the written language prefers gialda (Poulsen et al. 1998).
1360 (SDHK 2015, no. 7650), an Old Norwegian letter dated 1389 (preserved in a copy from 1410; DN [1848-1972], no. 514), and an Old Danish letter dated 1401 (Reg. Dan. 1892-1907, no. 3065).

Within legal language we find OSw. betala, ODa. betale in later laws and ordinances, such as Kristofers landslag from 1449 (Schlyter 1869) or the ordinances on fishing given around the turn of the fifteenth century by Eric of Pomerania and Queen Margaret I as an addendum to Skånske lov (Schlyter 1859, cxxviii and 466). In fifteenth-century copies of e.g. Skånske lov we begin to find ODa. betale as a variant of older gjalde (see e.g. Brøndum-Nielsen and Aakjer 1933, 18 line 7, 190 line 3, etc.), exactly as we find in Codex B.

As with betala (see above), skē begins to appear in Nordic around the turn of the fifteenth century and is found in many of the same legal texts, such as Kristofers Landslag (Schlyter 1869) and the ordinances on fishing in Skånske lov, where it is similarly used in connection with ODa. skathe 'damage' (Schlyter 1859, 472). ODa. ske is further found in fifteenth-century copies of law texts as a variant of varthe str vb ‘to become; to happen’ (e.g. Jyske lov; Skautrup 1933, 390 line 3).

Excursus: The prefix for-

Low German influence on the Nordic languages consists of more than mere lexical borrowings; as a closely related language, the West Germanic language was also

\[\text{skē wk vb 'to happen' < MLG schên (OSw. skē): 3 sg pres (scher) 52r4, 6. Codex A skīna str vb 'to appear' (OIcel. skīna): 3 sg pres (schin) 39v20, (scin) 40r2.}\]

Internal evidence suggests skē in Codex B traces back to an earlier skīna. Both tokens occur in Chapter 69, with the first in the opening line:

B Da en schadi ‘scher’ aff bieru | eldi (52r4-5)
‘When damage occurs from carried fire’


The preceding chapter (68) contains a similar opening, where both codices though notably use skīna:

B Kan so illa at bieras at schadi | ‘schin’ aff theim eldi (51v13-14)
‘If such ill can come to pass that damage occurs from that fire’


As with betala (see above), skē begins to appear in Nordic around the turn of the fifteenth century and is found in many of the same legal texts, such as Kristofers Landslag (Schlyter 1869) and the ordinances on fishing in Skånske lov, where it is similarly used in connection with ODa. skathe 'damage' (Schlyter 1859, 472). ODa. skē is further found in fifteenth-century copies of law texts as a variant of varthe str vb ‘to become; to happen’ (e.g. Jyske lov; Skautrup 1933, 390 line 3).

Excursus: The prefix for-

Low German influence on the Nordic languages consists of more than mere lexical borrowings; as a closely related language, the West Germanic language was also

\[\text{13 A diploma dated 3 February 1336 (SDHK 2015, no. 4218) also contains (beþala) and (beþal-nings), though this document is possibly a forgery.}\]
able to influence its northern neighbors at the structural level using local native lexical elements. This is especially evident in the prefix for-, found in combination both native and foreign elements.

In his study of the prefix, Johannisson (1939, 194) concludes, together with Falk and Torp (1910-1911), that for- originally belonged with nominals, while the related fyr- (later replaced by fyrir-) belonged with verbs. Under the influence of the Low German prefix vor-, used for both nouns and verbs, the use of for- spread into the domain formerly held by fyr(ir)- (var. for-, før-, firi- etc.), especially in East Norse (cf. Johannisson 1939, 226 et passim; Veturliði Óskarsson 2003, 188).

In Codex B we find the same process of for- replacing fyrir-, firi- in verbs. The prefix is found in three nouns in the manuscript: forðeþskapr 'witchcraft' (OIcel. forðǽðuskapr), formáli neut 'stipulation' (OIr. formáli), and forskel neut 'stipulation; use of senses' (OSw. forskel). In Guta saga both OGu. forðbuþ neut 'ban' (OIr. forðóð) and forðfall neut pl 'legal cause' (OIr. forðfall) are also found.

Among verbs with the prefix fyrir- (Codex A firi-) we find six with a similar meaning 'forfeit by X', where X is implied by the second element of the compound: bera 'to carry', ganga 'to walk', giefa 'to spend', gielda 'to pay', giera 'to do', stiela 'to steal'. Bilefeld always spells these compounds as two separate words, and the first member as ⟨fyr⟩. By contrast, OGu. fyrirrāþa str vb 'to betray' is spelled ⟨fyr|rada⟩ which may show influence from MLG vorraden.

Otherwise, we find verbs prefixed with for(e)- in Codex B, something which never occurs in the elder manuscript:

forbiaυpa str vb 'to forbid' (OIr. fyrirbjóða; MLG vorbêden): ptc nom sg neut ⟨forbudit⟩ 4r13. – fɔrspiella wk vb 'to ruin, destroy' (OIr. spilla, var. spella; MLG vorspillen, var. verspellen): inf ⟨fore | spiella⟩ 10v9-10. – forvarþa str vb 'to disappear' (OIr. fyrirverða; MLG vorwurden): 3 sg pres ⟨forward⟩ 37r8.

The final lexeme is not found in Codex A (§ 6.2.2), while the first is found as the older form nom pl neut ⟨firi buþin⟩ A 5r9. In the corresponding reading for fɔrspiella, Codex A is clearly interprets the element fyrir as a preposition, placing it between before the object:

B A theim fridi ma engin ‘fore | spiella androm’ hwaski hus ella garda (10v9-10)
‘During these periods of peace no one may destroy another’s house or fence’

Codex A originally read ⟨spilla⟩, thus identical with OGu. spilla vb ‘to ruin, destroy’ found elsewhere in Guta lag. However, both ⟨spiella⟩ in Codex B, as well as the

19 Both stressed (cf. Gm. vor-) and unstressed (verbal only; Gm. ver-); see Noreen (1904, 49).
20 Not in Codex A; § 6.1.4.
21 Codex A ⟨firi raþa⟩ A 37r9.
addition of ⟨e⟩ above the line by the main scribe in Codex A, point to a different lexical item, as appears to be the case with OIcel. *spilla* (pret -t-) and *spella* (pret -að-).

The evidence from the two Old Gutnish codices thus supports the conclusion drawn by Johannisson (1939): the prefix *for-* originally belonged to substantives, having later spread to verbs via influence from Low German.

### 6.2.2 Lexical variants

In addition to the Middle Low German loanwords found as variant readings in Codex B (§6.2.1), we find a number of lexical variants within the inherited vocabulary, although foreign influence may still be behind some of the readings found in the younger manuscript.

*bella* wk vb ‘to be able’. 3 sg pres ⟨bellir⟩ 13r5, 14v15, pl ⟨bella⟩ 15r5. Codex A

*orka* wk vb ‘id.’ (OIcel. orka): 3 sg pres ⟨orkar⟩ 12r4, ⟨orcar⟩ 13r16, pl ⟨orca⟩ 13v6.

Formally, OGu. *bella* can be connected with OIcel. *bella* ‘to deal with’, though the latter cannot take a modal function. The semantics ‘be able to’ are more closely reflected in OSw., ODa. *belde* ‘might, power’ (cf. also OIcel. *of-beldi* ‘violence’), though again a modal verb cognate of the Old Gutnish form is lacking.

The modal function of *bella* in Codex B can, however, be found elsewhere in Nordic, e.g. Elfdalian *bella* ‘to be able to’. In nearby Orsamål the auxiliary nature of *bälla* is further reflected in the pres sg *båll*, conjugated as a preterite-present verb, alongside the more expected *bällör*. A similar preterite-present conjugation can be found in the Nord-Trøndelag dialect forms of Norw. *bella* ‘to be able to’ (specifically Meråker and Verdal; see Norsk Ordbok 1966-2016, s.v. ‘bella’).

*ella* conj ‘or’ (OIcel. *ella*): ⟨ella⟩ 207 tokens, ⟨ellar⟩ 8 tokens, ⟨eller⟩ 9v16, ⟨ellr⟩ 5r13. Codex A

*eþa* conj ‘id.’ (OIcel. *eða*): ⟨eþa⟩ 195 tokens.

The form is found once in *Guta laug* in A as ⟨ella⟩ 6r18 and twice in *Guta saga* as ⟨ella⟩ 46v15 and ⟨ellar⟩ 45v9. Otherwise, the elder codex almost exclusively uses OGu. *eþa*, found once in Codex B in a marginal note on 41r (§3.3.1). Forms with -r are indistinguishable from OGu. *ellar* adv ‘otherwise’, found in five tokens in B spelled ⟨ellar⟩. On the other hand, it is not clear a formal distinction ever occurred between a conjunction *ella* without -r and an adverb *ellar* with -r; in the modern language both forms occur as a conjunction.

*for-verþa, for-varþa* str vb ‘to disappear’ (OIcel. *fyrir-verða*, OSw. *for-varþa*): 3 sg pres ⟨forward⟩ 37r8.

---

22 Including one ⟨eþi⟩ A 32r13.
This hapax is found in a provision containing multiple errors, including a misinterpretation of the verb:

B wil han ey siðan soyd sin wt loysa: tha haffui | want-PRES he-NOM not after creature-ACC his-ACC out let-INF then have-SUBJ sielffer schada eyn soyd, ier forwarder | ella dauder self-NOM damage-ACC one creature-ACC be-PRES vanish-PRES or dead-NOM med allu. (37r6-9) with all-DAT

The provision in Codex A has OGu. verri comp adj ‘worse’, presumably in the meaning ‘in a worsened state’, in place of forverþa. The Danish translation follows this reading, while the German uses the PRET PTC vorergert ‘damaged’:

A vil ham ai siðan ‘soyþ sen’ ut loysa. þa hæfi want-PRES he-NOM not after creature-ACC his-ACC out let-INF then have-SUBJ sielfr scæpa ‘en soyþr ir verri.’ eþa dauþr meþ self NOM damage-ACC if creature-NOM be-PRES worse-NOM or dead-NOM with allu. (31r5-7) all-DAT

‘If he does not want to release his creature after this, then he bears the damage himself if the creature is in a worsened state or completely dead.’

[Peel (2006, 374) lists the token in B as an adjective forvarþr meaning ‘sick, damaged, neglected’. However, the token must be 3 SG PRES, as an adjective would be based on the participle, for which we should expect NOM SG MASC *for(v)orþin (cf. OIcel. fyrirordinn). A grammatical reading of the provision would require the preceding words “soyd ier” [creature-ACC is] to be a scribal error for NOM SG soyþr ‘creature’ as the subject. Indeed, Bilefeld appears to have originally written ⟨soydir⟩ as a single word, having later changed ⟨ir⟩ to ⟨ier⟩ and added a word-dividing mark after]
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⟨soyd⟩ (Figure 6.1). Similar confusion of nom sg -r and 3 sg pres i(e)r is found elsewhere. However, reading the provision as soyþr forvarþr [the creature disappears] creates a grammatical problem with the following part of the provision, ella dauþr [or dead], which requires a copular verb. This lack of grammaticality, together with the coherence of recensions α, γ, and δ, points to forvarþa being a later emendation to the text, having never properly integrated into the sentence structure.

\[\text{rōp} \text{ neut 'cry, scream' (OIcel. bróp): dat sg ⟨ropi⟩ 30r4. Codex A ōp neut 'id.' (OIcel. óp): dat sg ⟨opi⟩ A 26v14.}\]

Cognates of OGu. ōp 'wail, cry' (OSw. õp, OIcel. óp) and the synonymous rōp (OSw. rōp, OIcel. brōp) are found as variant readings in other Old Nordic texts, e.g. Östgötalagen (see Collin and Schlyter 1830, 31 fn. 8) and Yngvars saga vísðforla (see Olson 1912, 36 fn. 6). In Old Danish, the corresponding verbs ópæ and rōpæ are found as variant readings in Eriks sjællandske lov (see Skautrup 1936, 95).

While it is impossible to say which reading may be older in the Old Gutnish text, as both lexemes derive from Proto-Germanic (óp < *wōpa-, rōp < *hrōpa-), it is worth noting the Danish translation reads ⟨op⟩ D 32v12 which, being less common in Danish than rōp (Da. råb), likely derives from an Old Gutnish original with ōp. As in Danish and Swedish, this lexeme is lost in Modern Gutnish, though rop survives.

\[\text{rykkia wk vb 'pull violently; manhandle' (OIcel. rykkja): 3 sg pres ⟨Ryckir⟩ 8v18. Codex A nykkia wk vb 'id.' (OIcel. bnykkja): 3 sg pres ⟨Nycchir⟩ A 8r6.}\]

In the provision where we find these variant readings, rykkia and nykkia are juxtaposed with OGu. rinda vb ‘to push’. A similar variation of ONw. rykkja and nykkja in juxtaposition with rinda can be found in Magnus Lagabøtes Landslov.

B  ‘Ryckir’ thu mand, ella | Rinder (8v18-19)
 ‘If you pull a man violently or push’


\[\text{MLL ef mæð rin|dr manní eða 'nyckir' (AM 60 4to, 43r11)}\]

‘If a man pushes a man or pulls violently’

‘nyckir\(^3\) ] ryckir AM 309 fol., 21r8.

In Codex B and AM 309 fol. rykkia (rykkja) ‘pull’ and rinda ‘push’ form alliterative pairs, although at an earlier stage in Old Gutnish and Old Norwegian the forms in Codex A and AM 60 4to would have alliterated, as both derive from forms with initial *h-. Alliteration of the Old Icelandic cognates is found in the Jónsbók law:

\[\text{\textsuperscript{23}For example, “Batir ier” 44v15 for hāt ir ‘[a] boat is’.}\]
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‘And so if one pushes or pulls violently’

The loss of *h- before the resonant r – and thus presumably before l and n as well – had already occurred in the tenth century on Gotland (Snædal 2002, 65), well before the codification of Guta lag. On the other hand, the chapter in which this provision is found (7) may easily predate the codification of the law, and stem back to an oral law tradition. Especially notable about the chapter is the high frequency of the 2 sg pronoun þū, found only in sixteen of the 82 chapters in Codex B. In chapter 24, another of the older sections, we find the related substantives nykkir and rindr placed alongside ryst ‘shaking’, which before the loss of *h- would have formed an alliterative triplet:

B 23v14 Tha en | trell far nyck ella Ryst: ella Rind:
‘When a slave receives a violent push or pull or shaking’

On the other hand, it is equally plausible that the doublet rindr eþa nykkir never formed an alliterative pair in Old Gutnish legal language, but was rather a formulaic phrase loaned in from Old Norwegian law, which appears to have influenced Guta lag on various levels (§1.3.1).

†sainast or †sīnast superl adv ‘latest, most recently’: ⟨siinnast⟩ 3v1. Codex A
snimst superl adv ‘id.’: ⟨snimst⟩ A 4v1.

Schlyter (1852, 293) interprets ⟨siinnast⟩ as a superlative corresponding with Sw. senast ‘latest’; the reading ⟨se|nist⟩ D 5v10-11 in the Danish translation would confirm this interpretation. However, †sīnast (or †sīnast) in the meaning ‘latest’ must be the superlative of OGu. *sain ‘late’ which, though unattested in Old Gutnish, survives in the modern language as sain with a diphthong (cf. OIcel. sein). We should then expect a superl *sainast, not †sīnast (cf. OIcel. sein(a)st). Furthermore, the spelling with geminate ⟨nn⟩ is problematic, as Bilefeld generally does not double non-geminate n; the only exception in Codex B is ⟨th⸌i⸍nn⟩ 4r4, which is a misreading for þeim, Codex A ⟨þaim⟩ A 5r2, and has been changed from ⟨þenn⟩. Rather, ⟨siinnst⟩ must have arisen via the misreading of minims, similar to ⟨th⸌y⸍nn⟩; the six minims ⟨ᵢᵢᵢᵢᵢᵢ⟩ should read ⟨nim⟩, giving a form snimast, corresponding with ⟨snimst⟩ in Codex A. Variants with and without a medial vowel a are known elsewhere in Nordic, e.g. OIcel. snimst vs. Far. (poët.) snimmast; OSw. ⟨snimst⟩ and snimmast.

Considering the reading with senest in the Danish manuscript, the misreading of minims in Codex B may stem back to a hypearchetype common to B and D.

þekkilikr adj ‘favored, pleasing’ (OIcel. þekkiligr): nom sg neut ⟨tøkkelighit⟩ 1bis r12.
Codex A dyrp fem ‘honor’: nom sg ⟨dyrp⟩ A 2r13.
Both Schlyter (1852, 7) and Pipping (1901, 5) read this token as \textlangle tekkelighit \textrangle, which would nevertheless be expected considering the Icelandic cognate; however, the first vowel more readily resembles Bilefeld’s ⟨o⟩ (see Figure 6.2). A form ⟨tokkelighit⟩ in turn resembles OIcel. \textlangle þokkaligr \textrangle ‘well-favored’ (only attested in the privative; ONP 2010, s.v. ‘óþokkaligr’), derived from þokki ‘thought, liking’ < PGmc. \textlangle þunkan- \textrangle; the expected Old Gutnish cognate, however, would be either \textlangle þunkalikr \textrangle or \textlangle þukkalikr \textrangle.

Neither interpretation sufficiently explains the ending ⟨lighit⟩, however. Although lenition of OGu. \textlangle -likr \textrangle > \textlangle -ligr \textrangle is found in Codex B (§ 4.1.1), we should not expect a vowel between \textgreek{g} and the \textgreek{neut} -t. The ending thus points to Danish influence, where the insertion of a vowel is known (cf. Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, IV, 94).

The token likely shows a conflation of two forms, namely OGu. \textlangle þekkilikr \textrangle and ODa. \textlangle þokkelik \textrangle. The latter, originally an independent lexeme cognate with OIcel. \textlangle þokkaligr \textrangle, eventually converged with ODa. \textlangle þækkelik \textrangle, cognate of both OIcel. \textlangle þekkiligr \textrangle and the presumably original Old Gutnish form.

### 6.2.3 Derivational Variants

Often the lexical variants found in Codex B are etymologically related to the readings found in the elder codex but differ in their word-formation.

\textbf{bregþan} \textgreek{fem} ‘quarrel’ (Far. \textlangle brigdan \textrangle): \textgreek{dat} \textgreek{sg} ⟨bregdan⟩ 34v13, 56v3. Codex A \textlangle brigzl \textrangle \textgreek{neut} ‘id.’ (OIcel. \textlangle brigzl \textrangle): \textgreek{dat} \textgreek{pl} ⟨brigslum⟩ A 1rb16, ⟨brigzlum⟩ A 29r13.

Both lexemes are substantivizations of OGu. \textlangle brigða \textrangle \textgreek{wk} (?) \textgreek{vb} ‘to blame; \textgreek{dep} to quarrel’, one with the suffix \textlangle -an \textrangle as in \textlangle brōan \textrangle (see next item), the other with the same \textgreek{sl}-suffix found in e.g. \textlangle vēnzl \textrangle \textgreek{fem} ‘suspicion’. The stem vowel in Codex B shows the form has been conflated with OGu. \textlangle bregþa \textrangle \textgreek{str} (?) \textgreek{vb} ‘to reproach’. Schlyter (1877, s.v. ‘Bregþa’) notes that OSw. \textlangle bregþa \textrangle “må ej förblandas med \textlangle brigþa \textrangle, såsom skett i gl. till [Hälsingelagen] och [Guta lag]” [should not be confused with \textlangle brigþa \textrangle as happened in Hälsingelagen and Guta lag]. The relevant passage from Hälsingelagen reads “Brigðher man adhrum garfwa sæt” MhB 6 (Schlyter 1844, 47) [If someone blames another for a settlement], where OSw. \textlangle brigþa \textrangle is used in the sense corresponding with OIcel. \textlangle bregða \textrangle \textgreek{str} \textgreek{vb} ‘to blame, upbraid’ (cf. Holmbäck and Wessén 1979, 346 note 72); the formation, on the other hand, resembles OIcel. \textlangle brigða \textrangle \textgreek{wk} \textgreek{vb} ‘to assert a claim’. In Codex B these two independent verbs have conflated, though Codex A maintains a difference between OGu. \textlangle bregþa \textrangle ‘to blame’ and \textlangle brigþa \textrangle ‘to assert a claim’. The former is found only once:
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A 'Bregþ’aþ’ maþr mannj slic oqueþins orþ (37v17-18)
blames-3 sg man-NOM man-DAT such insults-ACC PL
‘If a man accuses another with such insults’


The meaning ‘to blame, upbraid’ aligns both with the reading in Hälsingelagen and with OIcel. bregða. The syntax notably only aligns with the Old Swedish text, with DAT of person and ACC of thing; OIcel. bregða, by contrast, takes DAT of both person and thing (Fritzner 1954, s.v. ‘bregða’ 4).

OGu. brigha is found in two tokens in Codex A: 3 SG PRES SUBJ ⟨grigþir⟩ (read brigþir) 29v7, 3 PL PRES DEP ⟨brigþas⟩ 29r14; both corresponding tokens in B use ⟨e⟩. The only token in B with ⟨i⟩, PTC NOM SG MASC ⟨brigder⟩ 43r10, has no corresponding token in A.

brōan fem ‘road repair’: DAT SG ⟨Broan⟩ 52r9, 57r18. Codex A brōa-gerþ fem ‘id.’ (OIcel. brúar-gerð): DAT SG ⟨broa gerþ⟩ A 1vb9, ⟨broa gierþ⟩ 40r3.

The form in Codex B is formed from the vb brōa ‘to repair a road [or bridge]’ (from brō fem ‘bridge’) plus the (originally) deverbal suffix -an < PGmc. *-ōniz (Goth. -ōns), found elsewhere in Old Gutnish in e.g. burgan fem ‘buying on credit’ (OIcel. ramsakan fem ‘house search’ (OIcel. ramsokun ‘search’)). While cognates of brōa are found in the other Old Nordic languages (OIcel. brúa, OSw. brōa), the derivation with *-ōniz is unique to Old Gutnish, speaking for the productivity of this suffix. The form in Codex A is, by contrast, a compound of brō fem ‘bridge’ and gierþ fem ‘deed, action’; note the loss of GEN -r in brōar is common (Noreen 1904, 249, Pipping 1905-07, lxxiiiiff., Snædal 2002, 215).


The use of ⟨y⟩ for final unstressed -i is unusual, which might lead to the assumption it is a misreading of ⟨u⟩ (§4.3.7). However, that the token in B is a different lexeme, rather than merely a scribal error, is evident from the attributive sinm, semn PRON ‘his, hers, its’, which in B is DAT SG MASC sinum ⟨sinom⟩ 4v1 and not fem senni ⟨senni⟩ A 5r16.


The tokens are found in a list of items a father is required to give his illegitimate son should the son wish to leave the homestead:

24On the origin of this suffix, see e.g. Krabe and Meid (1969, III, 137).

‘Full arms, and bedclothes, falling and legvita, and a pillow, and fifteen ells of cloth for walking clothes.’

Schlyter (1877, s.v. ‘falda’) contends the items listed are reversed in the German manuscript, such that falda (falling) corresponds with decke ‘blanket’. OGu. legvita should then correspond with bette ‘bed’, Säve (1859, xxviii) notes the modern reflex Gu. lägita refers to a cotton or wool layer placed on the bed under the sheets.  

This leads Bugge (1877-1878, 266-267) to connect the first member of the compound with OIcel. leg neut ‘something laid’ and the second with OIcel. hvítill masc “quilt, blanket” (dim of *hvíta ‘something white’ > ‘wool, cotton’), resulting in a compound meaning “et hvitd Tæppe at ligge paa” (Bugge [1877-1878, 267] [a white blanket for lying on].

If legvita refers to the lower layer of bedding, then falda and falling must refer to the top layer or blanket. The two lexemes are clearly both related to the verb ‘to fold’ (OIcel. falda), and the form in A may have a parallel in the OIcel. hapax falda fem ‘head-covering’, found in a fragment of Snorra Edda (cf. ONP 2010, s.v. ‘falda sb. f.’ and references). The form in B is best analyzed as a dim of falda with the suffix -ling and connected with OIcel. felling fem ‘folding, folds of a garment’, though we should expect i-umlaut in the root vowel as in Icelandic (cf. Gu. källingg, kärlingg ‘middle-aged woman’ < karl ‘man’ + -ling).

fyrra adv ‘before, previously’ (OSw. förra, ‑y‑): ⟨fyrra⟩ 4 tokens. Codex A fyr adv ‘id.’ (OSw. før, ‑y‑; OIcel. fyr): ⟨fyr⟩ 10 tokens.

Monosyllabic fyr is also found in Codex B alongside disyllabic fyrra. Disyllabic forms from the comparative adjective < PGmc. *furizan‑ ‘earlier, prior’ are known from other Nordic languages, often existing side-by-side as variants of the monosyllabic descendants of PGmc. *furiz ‘before’: OIcel. fyrrí, fyr; OSw. förra, för (‑y‑); ODa. flerre, fyr. The two forms are frequently found as variant readings in the manuscripts, e.g. Västmannalagen “som ængon atte førre (var. fyrra, fyr)” II MhB 24 (Schlyter [1841], 154) [which no one had before] and Stjórn “ok fyr (var. fyrra) var nefndr” Gn 24:2-3 (Astas 2009, 203) [and was named before].

Final -a in Sw. förra (OSw. förra, ‑y‑) is likely taken from the neut sg form of the adjective (SAOB [1898], s.v. ‘förr’), which may also explain the Old Gutnish

25 “På sänghalten lägges först underklädet, derefter kommer ett ylle- eller vadmaltäcke, som kallas lägita eller legta t., och öfverst lägges lakanen” (Säve 1859, xxviii).

26 Note OIcel. hvíta fem is attested in reference to a dairy product, likely skyr (ONP 2011, s.v. ‘hvíta’).
form. On the other hand, the final -a may have been taken analogically from other adverbs, such as OGu. illa ‘ill, badly’, which also happened in OGu. verra ‘worse’, mentioned above (§6.1.1). Notably, both fyrra (fyr) ‘before’ and verra (ver) ‘worse’ are comparative in meaning, though lacking corresponding positive forms. The extension to disyllabic forms was possibly influenced by the semantics, as other comparative adverbs tend to be disyllabic, e.g. OGu. maira ‘more’, which may provide another analogical source of final -a.

*huaski* conj and pron ‘neither’ (OICel. hvárki): ⟨huaski⟩ 4 tokens, ⟨hwaski⟩ 8 tokens. Codex A *huatki* conj and pron ‘id.’: ⟨huatki⟩ 9 tokens, ⟨huathci⟩ 5r11; *huarki* ‘id.’: ⟨huarki⟩ 42v11.

Originally the neut of *huārgi(n)* pron ‘neither’ (OICel. hvárgi, -n), the form in Codex B likely derives its s from a gen form *huats‑gi* with regular assimilation of *ts > s* (cf. Noreen 1904, 422-423; Gustavson 1948, 182-183) and is identical in formation to Old and Middle Swedish forms such as huazke, huazte and Dalecarlian (Elfd., Orsa) wast. Both forms in Codex A likely go back to an original *huartki* with a reduction of the consonant cluster. Loss of r is seen in hwārt (heldr) ‘whether, whichever’, found both as ⟨huart⟩ 4 tokens and ⟨huat⟩ 8 tokens in the elder codex (B only r-less forms). The t-less form *huarki* occurs in chapter 35, which is a later addition to the text (§3.1.4); that the form originally contained *r* is seen in -ki < *‑gi* following voiceless stops (cf. Noreen 1904, 204). All three forms survive in the modern language: OGu. *huaski* > Gu. vasken, *huatki* > vakken, *huarki* > varken.

Internal evidence suggests *huaski* is a later emendation to the text; a defective reading in chapter 4, which is missing in the other three recensions (§3.1.1) points to a form as in Codex A:

\[
\begin{align*}
B & \quad \text{so et} \quad \text{hwat tima} \quad \text{prestr} \quad \text{at sia sakom,} \quad | \quad \text{ella wider sia sakom} \\
& \quad \text{so that what} \quad \text{time‑acc} \quad \text{priest‑nom} \quad \text{to see} \quad \text{case‑dat} \quad \text{pl} \quad \text{or} \quad \text{with} \quad \text{see} \\
& \quad (6r18-19)
\end{align*}
\]

Pipping (1905-07, 9 fn. 3) notes “hwat tima” must derive from an exemplar with ⟨huatci ma⟩; confusion of ⟨c⟩ and ⟨t⟩ is otherwise known from both Old Gutnish manuscripts, e.g. INF ļātta ⟨iacta⟩ A 2r5 and ACC SG NEUT sett ⟨secht⟩ B 1bis v8. The original reading would then have been as follows:

*GL* so et huatki mā prestr at sā sakom, ella viþr sā sakom

‘So that the priest may neither act as plaintiff or as defendant in such cases’

Note Gu. (Lau) vakken pron ‘which’, which Lidén (1936) connects with OSw. hualk‑ (a side‑form of builikin > Sw. vilken, cf. Gu. vikken), is not the same as vakken conj ‘nor’ < huatki.
It is not clear whether this change from *huatki* to *huaski* was made by a Gotlander or an outsider; ODa. *huaske*, known from Scania (GDOB 1999, s.v. ‘hvatkyns’), survives today in the Blekinge dialect as *vasken* (cf. Lundbladh and Reiz 2013, s.v. ‘varken’).

*naïta* wk vb ‘to deny, to renounce’ (OLcel. *neïta*): INF ⟨neytha⟩ 1bi|r3. Codex A

*naïka* wk vb ‘id.’ (OSw. *nēka*): A ⟨naicca⟩ A 2r5.

The variant in B is formed, as in Icelandic, with the same *t*-suffix as in its antonym *iātta* vb ‘to assent’ (OLcel. *jātta, jātta*). Cognates in Icelandic and Norwegian can also be found with geminate *tt*, e.g. OLcel. *neitta* (cf. ONP 2010, s.v. ‘neîta’) and Norw. *neitta*, a side-form of *neïta*. However, as Bilefeld never spells intervocalic geminate *tt* with ⟨th⟩ (§ 4.1.1), the Gutnish form is best analyzed as *naita*.

The form in A shows the same *k*-suffix as found in OSw. *iaka* wk vb ‘to assent’. Despite the geminate spelling in Codex A, the form should possibly be interpreted as OGu. *naïka* with a single *k*, considering the modern descendant *naïkä*.

Both formations, as well as a combinative *kt*-suffix, are found in Old East Norse as in OSw. *nēta*, *nēka*, *nekta*; ODa. *nēte*, *nēke*, *nækte*. That Old Gutnish should also have two formations is thus unsurprising. Considering the common confusion of ⟨c⟩ and ⟨t⟩ in the manuscripts, however, including ⟨iacta⟩ A 2r5 for INF *iātta*, we cannot rule out the possibility that the reading in B is not OGu. *naita*, but rather a misreading of *naïkka*, the only form to survive in the modern language.

### 6.2.4 Phonetic variants

Various phonetic processes have caused individual lexemes to have a different appearance in the two Old Gutnish codices, such as *huer* PRON ‘who’ in Codex A and *huar* in Codex B (§ 4.3.8). Some developments are irregular and/or confined to a single lexeme, such as the developments which affected *nequar, naquar* PRON ‘somebody’ (§ 5.1.4). The present section examines three more lexemes which differ in the two codices due to lexically specific or irregular developments.

*fiugurtān* num ‘fourteen’ (OLcel. *fjórtán*): ⟨fiugur|tan⟩ 8v9-10. Codex A

*fiurtān* (OLcel. *fjǫgurtán*): ⟨fiurtan⟩ 7v19, 9r17.

Short-stemmed *fiurtān* is also found in Codex B as ⟨fiwrtan⟩ 10r19, where ⟨w⟩ gives insight into the length of *iū* (§ 4.3.3). Clear evidence for the long-stemmed *fiugurtān* is not found elsewhere in Gutnish; in the runic corpus only the short-stemmed

---

28 Geminate spelling for single *k* is found in the token sup *takit* ⟨tak|kit⟩ A 10v15-16; however, this may merely be due to the line break. In Norwegian both *neika* and *neikka* occur, among other forms.

29 Unless, of course, we are to interpret this form as the same *kt*-suffix as in ODa. *nekte* (Da. *negte*), though there seems to be no evidence for such a form elsewhere in the Nordic languages.
fiūrtān is found (fiurtan G 99, G 100; fiurtando ‘fourteenth’ G 70, G 170; fiurtanto ‘id.’ †G 129). Alongside three tokens of fiurtan in the 1328 runic calendar (NKS 203 8vo) we find a single token fiurtan CR 9, which Ole Worm later amends to fiuhrtan CR 5 for his first edition (Lithberg and Wessén 1939, 130 et passim). Whether these forms point to a long stem fiugur- is unclear; nom-acc neut fiugur is always clearly spelled a disyllabic fiuhur in the calendar, whereas fiurhtan and fiuhrtan show monosyllabic stems.

Elsewhere in the Old Nordic languages both long and short stems are found for ‘fourteen’, e.g. OIcel. fjǫgurtán, fjórtán; OSw., ODa. fiughurtān, fiūrtān. Of the two stems, the longer shows a more regular development from PGmc. *fedwartehun (Goth. fidwortaíhun, OE fēowertīene) with *d (*ð) > g because of the labial (cf. Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, II, 28; IV, 190, Kroonen 2013, s.v. ‘fedwar-’). While the short stem in OIcel. fjör-, OSw. fiūr- resembles the stem of nom masc fjórir, fiūrir ‘four’, the Old Gutnish evidence precludes a direct connection (e.g. the short stem of fjórtán built on analogy of fjórir). Instead, the triphthong in the OGu. stem fiuur- (only attested in dat fiurum) points to a Proto-Norse stage *feur- (from PGmc. *fedwar) with complete loss of *d as in West Germanic (OE fōwer). Meanwhile, the short stem of fiūrtān must derive from a contraction of fiugurtān, with compensatory lengthening of iu > iū due to the loss of -g-.

There is no reason to assume fiugurtān in Codex B stems from David Bilefeld and his native language; by the sixteenth century the short form fiūrtān (Da. fjorten) dominated in Danish (Brøndum-Nielsen 1928-73, IV, 203). The long form fiughurtān (fiughærtān) is still known from Jutish dialects in the fifteenth century (ibid.), meaning the scribe of β1470 could have been responsible for the form in Codex B, were he a Jutlander like Bilefeld. However, considering the evidence from the other Old Nordic languages and the developments from Proto-Germanic, it seems most reasonable to take ⟨fiugur|tan⟩ in Codex B as an archaism.

hari masc ‘hare’ (OSw. hare): dat pl ⟨harum⟩ 55v3, 57v6, ⟨harom⟩ 53v4. Codex A heri (OIcel. heri): dat pl ⟨herum⟩ 1vb15, 40v12 (two tokens).

The root vowel in A shows effects of r-umlaut, known from West Norse, whereby PN *r < PGmc. *z palatalizes preceding vowels, as in OIcel. heri < PGmc. *hazan-. Codex B, on the other hand, shows a non-palatalized root vowel, in line with East Norse forms.

The details of r-umlaut in Old Gutnish are unclear; while the diphthong *au and high back vowel *ū appear to always undergo this palatalization (PGmc. *auzōn-neut ‘ear’ > OGu. oyra, Gu. āire; PGmc. *āz prep ‘out of’ > OGu. yr, Gu. óir), the low vowel *ā avoids fronting (raising) in nom pl fem þār prep ‘they’ (OSw. þær, OIcel. þár). Original short a is raised in OGu. bera vb ‘to bare’ (OSw. bara,
6.3. READINGS CLARIFIED IN CODEX B

OIcel. *bera* < PGmc. *bazōn- and the related Gu. bær(ar) adj ‘naked’ (OSw. bar, OIcel. berr), though not in OGu. kar neut ‘vessel’ (OSw. kar, OIcel. ker) < PGmc. *kaza-, despite Gu. kär with raising from the same etymon. The Old Gutnish form is attested twice in Codex A and once in the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild, though is absent from Codex B. The tokens in A, NOM SG ⟨car⟩ A 41v16 and ACC PL ⟨kar⟩ A 42v3, both occur in later additions to the text, in provisions integrated into chapters 33 and 35 in Codex B (§3.1.4).

It appears the non-umlauted forms kar and hari entered the Old Gutnish legal language at some point, under the influence of the mainland, and survived alongside native forms *ker and heri.

**mangr** adj ‘many’. NOM PL MASC ⟨mangir⟩ 21r12, NOM PL NEUT ⟨mang⟩ 32v6, ACC PL MASC ⟨manga⟩ 23r12, DAT PL ⟨mangom⟩ 15r13. Codex A **margr** (OIcel. margr): NOM PL NEUT ⟨marg⟩ 28v9, ACC PL MASC ⟨marga⟩ 20r11, DAT PL ⟨margum⟩ 13v12, GEN PL ⟨margra⟩ 39r15.

Both forms derive from PGmc. **managa-**, with OGu. margr arising via the same dissimilation of *m-n > *m-r as in OIcel. margr, the only form known in Icelandic (cf. OIcel. mengi neut ‘crowd’ from the same root). In Old Swedish, both margher and manger are found (the latter surviving today as mången), while in Elfdalian the r-form marger is found in some varieties as a side-form of maungger.

Codex A shows a perfect distribution of r- and n-forms, with margr being only attested in Gutla lag, while mangr occurs in Gutla saga in three tokens: NOM PL MASC ⟨Mangir⟩ 41r1, ACC ⟨manga⟩ 45r4, DAT ⟨mangum⟩ 48r3. The latter form also survives today as Gu. manggä (neut mang).

Codex B, on the other hand, mostly has mangr, yet margr also appears in a single token, GEN PL ⟨margra⟩ 51r5. The token is found in chapter 65, which also contains the anomalous use of 3 PL PRES ⟨aiga⟩ 50v16 with ⟨ai⟩ for expected ⟨ei⟩ or ⟨ey⟩ (§4.3.4). Though Holmback and Wessen (1979, lxviii) consider this the final chapter of the older sections of Gutla lag, these anomalies indicate the β recension drew chapter 65 from a different source than the preceding chapters. Considering their distribution in Codex A, margr is likely an older form than mangr, meaning chapter 65 likely entered the β recension after mangr had replaced margr.

6.3 Readings clarified in Codex B

Codex B is instrumental in the clarification of defective readings in the elder codex, also at the lexical level. Pipping (1901, 88-89), for example, finds the reading ⟨lyndir⟩ 31v11 in Codex B to be the correct form rather than ⟨lyndir⟩ A 28r2 in Codex A, identifying the word as ACC PL loyndir fem ‘private parts’ and cognate with OIcel. leynd fem ‘secret’.
Here I present three additional readings not previously suggested as defective in Codex A, though the reading in Codex B helps to identify the underlying form.

**axlar-hoyþ** FEM 'shoulder-height' (Far. *akslahædd*): ACC SG ⟨axlarhawd⟩ 31v15. Codex A 'tæxlar-hafuþ' ⟨axlar hafuþ⟩ A 28r5.

Pipping (1905-07, Ordbok 8) interprets the two words in A as GEN SG *axlar* 'shoulder' and ACC SG *hafuþ* 'head' forming a compound meaning 'shoulderblade, shoulder'. This meaning aligns with the German manuscript, which reads ⟨schulde re⟩ G 16vb25 'shoulders'. The Danish manuscript, on the other hand, translates the concept as "axler eller hoffuid" D 34v7 [shoulders or head], with both *aksler* 'shoulders' and *hoved* 'head'.

One might interpret the element ⟨hawd⟩ as a late reflex of OGu. *hafuþ*, considering the Modern Gutnish reflexes such as *hauð*, *hæud*, and *hud* alongside (Fårö) *hávud*. On the other hand, *hafuþ* is not an uncommon word in the Guta lag text; fourteen other tokens are found in Codex B, all clearly spelled with ⟨f⟩.

Instead, I propose to connect ⟨axlarhawd⟩ in Codex B with Far. *akslahædd* FEM 'shoulder height', with the element *hædd* corresponding with e.g. OIcel. *hæð* 'height' < *PGmc. *hauhiþō- (Engl. height). The expected outcome in Old Gutnish is *hoyþ* with i-umlaut; the spelling ⟨aw⟩ may then be added to the examples of ⟨au⟩ for expected ⟨oy⟩ (§4.3.7). Gu. *háigd* 'height' shows i-umlaut, though an analogical *g* has been inserted based on *haugar* ADJ 'high'.


Säve (1859, xxxi) notes the reading in B might be a scribal error for *laga*, the reading found in Codex A and further confirmed by ⟨rechte⟩ G 18ra9 'lawful' in the German manuscript, though tentatively connects ⟨lad⟩ with OICel. *lād* NEUT 'grassland'. The compound *lap-farvegr* would then indicate a track through grazing land, as opposed to a simple *farvegr*, mentioned in the previous provision. As noted by Peel (2015, 156 note 24f/14), there is only a subtle difference between the final two provisions of chapter 37; Säve’s solution hardly provides any more clarity. However, connecting ⟨lad⟩ to OICel. *hlað* NEUT 'pavement, road surface’ allows for reading ⟨lad farwegh⟩ as ‘paved road’; the two provisions may thus be interpreted as follows:

> B § Gierder mader sir haga | yfir farwegh mans: ta gieri han | hanom liid, oc ‘hin’ fari 
>     thet som han | fyrra foor. § Tha en gierder ater | gatu mans yfir lad farwegh mans | 
>     ta gieri than lid som gardin eygir. | oc han wardi lidiom som weghe eygir. (34v5-12) 
> ‘If someone builds a hedge for himself across someone’s pathway, then he must create an opening for the other so that he may travel as before. When [he] fences someone’s road across someone’s paved path, then he who owns the fenced land creates the opening and he who owns the path takes responsibility for the opening.’
The difference between the two provisions thus lies in the type of path: should someone block a farvegr, he is to create an opening for passage; if it is a paved farvegr, the owner is responsible for the upkeep of the opening.


The token in B points to OGu. \textit{uf-drykkia,} cognate with O1cel. \textit{ofdrykkja} ‘id.’ (lit. ‘too much drink’). The lack of \textit{a-}umlaut in Old Gutnish allowed for the confusion of the prefix \textit{uf-} < PGmc. *uba with \textit{upp} ‘up’.

6.4 Discussion

Our knowledge of the Old Gutnish lexicon would suffer great loss without the witness of Codex B and its descendant manuscripts. The limited corpus of the language means only a small fragment of the vocabulary is attested, a significant amount of which is provided in the younger codex. Even items which are present in Codex A can at times only be clarified by the witness of Codex B.

Many of the vocabulary items found only in Codex B are what we should expect the Old Gutnish form to be, considering cognates from closely related languages; that they are only attested in the younger manuscript is merely a question of quantity. It is thus no surprise that Old Gutnish had such basic lexical items as \textit{betr} ‘better’ and \textit{ver} ‘worse’, or even more complex items such as \textit{framlaiþis} ‘further’ and \textit{laupstīgr} ‘getaway; flight’, as cognates are found across the Nordic world. On the other hand, even some formally expected items give greater insight into the spread of the Old Nordic vocabulary; OGu. \textit{formāli} ‘stipulation’, for example, is otherwise only found in Old West Norse, while the semantics of \textit{bella} ‘to be able’ are paralleled only in Central Scandinavia. Meanwhile, the semantics of \textit{intekt} ‘taking in (with a woman)’ are unique to Gotland.

Especially important for the study of Old Nordic are the vocabulary items only known on Gotland; for some, Codex B is our only source. Most of these items are compounds, such as \textit{befroyta} ‘bed-wetting’ and \textit{runfemni} ‘ability to run’, which increases our understanding of word-formation in the Old Nordic languages.

Word-formation is frequently what distinguishes Codex B from the elder codex in items such as \textit{brōan} ‘road repair’ and \textit{bregþan} ‘quarrel’, two items showing the productiveness of the nominal suffix \textit{-an}. Developments within Old Gutnish are also seen in \textit{fyrra} ‘before’ and \textit{verra} ‘worse’.

Finally, Codex B shows a vocabulary continuously augmented with loans, both from German and Danish during the Late Middle Ages. Loans from German (especially Low German) are otherwise found throughout the Nordic world, such as \textit{betala} ‘to pay’ and the prefix \textit{for-}, whose histories are well known. The question of
Danish vocabulary, on the other hand, can be difficult to answer, as the languages are closely related and it is not always possible to distinguish a loan from an inherited item based on form alone; OGu. rōp 'cry, scream', for example, could either be loaned from Danish or inherited from Proto-Germanic.

This final example succinctly illustrates the central question regarding the language of Codex B: How much is Danish, and how much is Gutnish?
Chapter 7

Old Gutnish in Danish Hands

Gotland, 1587. Following the tumultuous decades of the late fourteenth and early fifteenth centuries, the island had remained Danish territory ever since the Teutonic Order relinquished control in 1408. Members of the ruling class belonged to the Danish educated elite, including David Hansen Bilefeld, a priest from Jutland who, only five years prior, had been promoted to Provost over the Northern Riding. His position required that he be familiar with the law; yet the island was not governed by the legislation of his native Jutland in which he was well versed, nor by the other Danish provincial laws, but rather the Gotlanders’ own medieval law, written in the Gotlanders’ own medieval language.

On the nineteenth of May in that year, Bilefeld sat down to copy this law text known as *Guta lag*, the Gotlanders’ Law, on eight paper quires in folio. Nearly three centuries later, this modest document would appear in a scholarly publication for the first time and receive the nickname ‘Codex B’, by which it has been known ever since.

The present dissertation has investigated Codex B from a multitude of angles – codicological, text critical, as well as linguistic – in order to shed light on this witness of *Guta lag*, a text which is only known from a collateral group of four manuscript witnesses, here referred to as Codices A, B, G, and D. Of these, only A and B are preserved in the Old Gutnish language of medieval Gotland; G is a German translation from 1401, D a Danish translation from the sixteenth century. As such, Codex B is not only a witness of *Guta lag*, but constitutes half of the witnesses of the text in the original language.

In Chapter 2 I concluded that the scribe of Codex B, David Bilefeld, copied the manuscript for his own personal use as a reference tool. This can be seen within the framework of material philology and the notion that “form follows function” ([Hufnagel 2012](#), 174): the script is quick, yet legible; the decoration minimal, yet rubrics, chapter numbers, and a clear table of contents result in a manuscript that
is easy to use. Marginal notes are found throughout the manuscript, attesting to a document used by its creator, whose focus on function can be seen on the title page, which he never completed.

That his exemplar manuscript dates to 1470 has never been questioned, neither here nor in previous research of Codex B and the Gutlag manuscripts. Bilefeld explicitly states that he copied the Codex B “iuxta | tenorem Veteris Exemplaris | Anno MCD.LXX Scripti” 55r17-19 [according to the exemplar written in the year 1470], which likely indicates the exemplar manuscript contained this date somewhere in the colophon. Who the scribe was, or what purpose the manuscript was intended to fulfill, cannot be known for sure, though we are able to piece together some details of this lost codex β1470.

As with the other manuscripts of Gutlag, β1470 was likely a quarto; considering the date, it would probably have been copied on paper rather than parchment. It may have been written in a Gothic half-cursive or hybrid script, similar to that of the Jyske lov manuscript Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 9 4to dated to the same year (see Figure 7.1).

The text of Codex B is argued in Chapter 3 to be a well-integrated, fairly complete copy of Gutlag, both retaining older provisions that have been lost in the other known recensions and also containing later additions to the law that would have entered the various recensions independently. It is nevertheless clear that the exemplar manuscript did not contain all the chapters and provisions found in Bilefeld’s hand; at times, Bilefeld was moved to supplement the text with marginalia...
taken from Codex A, the lost Codex X, and even the German manuscript G. The evidence even suggests Bilefeld copied an entire chapter, Chapter 24, from Codex A.

The relation of Codex B to the other known manuscripts and its placement within a stemma codicum was also treated in Chapter 3. Concluding that linguistic errors common to the two Old Gutnish manuscripts reveal no information regarding the exemplars of G and D, I rejected the previously drawn stemma on methodological grounds. Instead, by assessing the textual variation found in the four manuscripts and, to an extent, the lexical variation, I proposed a new grouping AD:BG.

Chapters 4-6 discussed various linguistic aspects of Codex B; despite separating the discussion into chapters on orthography and phonology (Chapter 4), morphology (Chapter 5), and lexicon (Chapter 6), the conclusions drawn can be summed up in one common finding: alongside heavy Danish influence in all aspects of the language, we also find native Gutnish developments, as well as the retention of older forms not found in Codex A.

Danish influence is evident throughout the manuscript. Direct transfer from sixteenth-century Danish can be seen in the use of ⟨ffu⟩ for intervocalic [β], the transfer of Danish forms in the common and technical (ecclesiastical and legal) vocabulary, and the transfer of entire phrases such as til lif og sjæl [to body and soul]. Much of the Danish influence can be attributed to the scribe David Bilefeld; on the other hand, some examples of Danish influence cannot sufficiently be traced to him, and instead point to the scribe of the exemplar manuscript, who we may reasonably assume was also a Dane. Some clues may point to a Scanian scribe of the exemplar manuscript, such as the use of ⟨o⟩ in ØGu. sun ‘son’, or the use of huaski ‘neither’ for huatki. Future research may provide more clues for this scribe’s origin.

Native Gutnish developments are also found in Codex B, for which the remainder of the corpus, especially the Statutes of St. Catherine’s Guild from 1449, provides invaluable comparative evidence. Within the phonology, we can see the lowering of ul > ol before non-dental consonants had occurred by the middle of the fifteenth century, while within the morphology we find the leveling of irregular verbs such as aiga in the present tense. Increasing foreign influence on the language is also evident in the manuscript in the form of loanwords from Low German.

Despite the younger character of the language in Codex B, the manuscript also preserves older forms not found in the elder manuscript. The presence of extra provisions and chapters results in a significant amount of vocabulary items not found elsewhere, some of which are not otherwise known outside of Old Gutnish.

Our knowledge of Old Gutnish is fortunately not limited to Codex A, and despite the small corpus of Guta lag, there is still much to be found. The present study has included the translated manuscripts G and D, yet further research is still needed
for a better understanding of the Old Gutnish exemplars behind these translations. Some work has been done on the German manuscript (see e.g. Czajkowski 2005; Schmid 2006, 2016), though next to nothing has been said of the Danish manuscript. Similar methods can likewise be applied to the corpus of Guta saga, for which only one Old Gutnish version is known; the narrative is otherwise known in Middle German, Old Swedish, and Danish.
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<td>är</td>
<td>120 130 156 189</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aign</td>
<td>137 160 161 174</td>
<td>ariba</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aigna</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>armleggr</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aitloptr</td>
<td>151 152 187</td>
<td>armr</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bella</td>
<td>130 211 223</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

bera____ 74, 206, 210, 220
beria____ 147
berykta____ 136, 208
betala____ 208, 209, 223
betr____ 199, 201, 229
betri____ 199
bēþ______ 199
berg, bāþi____ 164
béþir, bāþir____ 133, 134, 164
béþroyta____ 199, 223
biþaþa____ 132, 134
biþera____ 120, 129
bisðalr____ 116, 143
biskupr____ 116, 143
dag____ 185, 194
bīþia____ 13
dagvark____ 118, 185
blōþ____ 113
dauþr____ 3, 114, 14, 213
bōl____ 155, 157
diaupr____ 23, 91, 115
bōndi____ 82, 113, 190, 191
bōr____ 155, 216
drag____ 163
bōt____ 157
draga, dreg____ 60, 133, 134
braþ____ 162
braþf____ 92
drep____ 112, 140
bregða____ 123
dröavn____ 202, 203
bregða____ 215
brēgðan____ 215, 223
bresta____ 142
briðs____ 202, 203
briaðnu____ 3, 202, 203
brigðl____ 123, 215
brigða____ 215, 216
brið____ 216
brō____ 216
brōa____ 216
brōaþreg____ 124, 216
brōaþan____ 124, 215, 216, 223
efla____ 114
brōk____ 184
efni, enmi____ 128
brōþ____ 141
Ekki____ 134
brūsthali____ 202
eldr____ 178
brutfall____ 200
ella, 30, 31, 81, 97, 99, 100
bryde____ 139
bryþlingi____ 93, 184
bryþlingr____ 93
ellar____ 30, 211
bukk____ 116
en____ 100
burgan____ 117, 206, 216
burinn____ 206
burna____ 206
burinn____ 206
burinn____ 206
burt, bort____ 8, 113, 200
eptir____ 113, 141
byggia____ 81, 118, 147
erfi____ 114
byþ____ 147, 164, 165, 196
ertaug____ 140, 148, 184
ét____ 197
113, 130, 156
býa____ 114, 113, 131, 141
 étar manna skrá____ 136
étar menn____ 156
etningar____ 118
fá____ 23, 156
falda____ 216, 217
falla____ 216, 127
falling____ 216, 127
Fara____ 113, 157
Fall____ 12
Fari____ 189
Farih____ 152
fē____ 10, 150
Femmi____ 128
Femti____ 127
ferþ____ 162
Festa____ 11
Fægar____ 66
Fæþrni____ 141
Fiarir____ 220
Fiarpi____ 132
Fiarungr____ 132
Fiaurir____ 26, 152, 220
Fiaur____ 132
Fielkunnugr____ 142
Fingr____ 189
Firi býaþa____ 210
Firi rāþa____ 210
Fíurtan, fiugurtan____ 157
### Modern Gutnish

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modern Gutnish</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-en, -i</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ag</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aist</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>akar</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ann</td>
<td>3, 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arm</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>at</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>att</td>
<td>114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attä</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>atā</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>badar</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ban</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barn, ban</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>biskáp, bisp</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braust</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>braute</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brautä</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brok</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bräidä</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>burt</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bådd</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bår(ar)</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bårt</td>
<td>224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>böite</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>da</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dag</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>daudar</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>denne</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>diaupar</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>disen</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dotar</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dragä</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>draugar</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drägä</td>
<td>163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dänu</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>döimä</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fa</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fattir</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fjärde</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>flauge</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>frid</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fuldar</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fylle</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fä</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>falk</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gnaiste</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gull</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gute</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gälde</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gärä</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gäst</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gämnä</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>gåuvar</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ba</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bal</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baur, báud, bud</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baul</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bárd</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bárd(a)</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>báud, báud, bud</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>baut</td>
<td>222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nöiar</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>med</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>me(i)lä</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>meu</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mëst</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mänk</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mant</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>maste</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mårk</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mårk(a)</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mårk(a)gard</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
INDEX

ret, reit________________ 23  
retar__________________ 10, 115  
rop____________________ 213  
ryg____________________ 10, 165  
rännä__________________ 199  
råite, -å________________ 199  
sain____________________ 214  
silvar, sylvar___________ 144  
singgä__________________ 10  
sinkä___________________ 10  
sjauende________________ 201  
skudä___________________ 204  
skulld__________________ 169  
skulå____________________ 11  
skåug___________________ 23  
stad___________________ 10, 164  
stain___________________ 9, 23  
varken_________________ 218  
varå____________________ 182  
vasken__________________ 218  
vyrste__________________ 142  
äut____________________ 123  
ävvar__________________ 180  
äire____________________ 220  
åuä_____________________ 180  
öir______________________ 220  
öl______________________ 150, 158  
vara____________________ 11  

Dalecarlian

bella (Elfd.)___________ 211  
jätå (Elfd.)___________ 204  
ula (Elfd.)___________ 179  
bruok (Elfd.)__________ 184  
jätå (Orsa)___________ 204  
uppin (Elfd.)__________ 166  
bälla (Orsa)___________ 211  
kumå (Elfd.)__________ 158  
wast (Elfd.)___________ 218  
dag (Elfd.)_____________ 158  
marger (Elfd.)__________ 221  
wast (Orsa)_____________ 218  
djärra (Elfd.)__________ 158  
maungger (Elfd.)_______ 221  
Övdalsk (Elfd.)________ 8  
ippiin (Orsa)____________ 166  
sela (Elfd.)____________ 158  

Old Danish

alder______________ 199  
fyrre______________ 217  
nète______________ 219  
amner______________ 193  
før(e)-____________ 210  
nakte______________ 219  
betale______________ 208, 209  
get______________ 131  
nethe______________ 201  
brök______________ 184  
give______________ 104  
öp______________ 93, 213  
baldë______________ 211  
gjalde______________ 209  
rīthe______________ 193  
det______________ 81  
göre______________ 177  
röp______________ 213  
dette______________ 81  
hvaske______________ 219  
röpe______________ 213  
fiuṛtān, fiughurtān__ 220  
meth______________ 138  
whathe______________ 209  
fül______________ 138  
maethen______________ 138  
skē______________ 209  
fyr______________ 217  
nēke______________ 219  
thokkelik____________ 215
Modern Danish
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dutch</th>
<th>Old English</th>
<th>Modern English</th>
<th>Faroese</th>
<th>Finnish</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>böchel (Mid.)</td>
<td>byre</td>
<td>height</td>
<td>akslæðed</td>
<td>akslæðed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fēower</td>
<td></td>
<td>avstand</td>
<td>avstånd</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>zullen</td>
<td>ealh</td>
<td></td>
<td>betala</td>
<td>betala</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-lijk</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>brigdan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>bygd</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>gjalda</td>
<td>gjalda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>koltur</td>
<td>koltur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>koltr</td>
<td>koltr</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>koltur</td>
<td>koltur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>snimma</td>
<td>snimma</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>stólpur</td>
<td>stólpur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tjaldur</td>
<td>tjaldur</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>keypa</td>
<td>keypa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>æta</td>
<td>æta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Old Frisian

epen_____________ 166  open_____________ 166  wereld, wergeld______ 17

Middle German

alleweldich (L)____ 207  högen (L)______ 150  verrechten (L)____ 208
antwarden, antwerden (L)____ 168  hüs gewelde (L)____ 93  vor- (L)______ 100, 210
beruchten (L)______ 208  manvrede (L)____ 186  voränderen (L)____ 93
betalen (L)_______ 208  mark (H)______ 64  vorbêden (L)____ 210
bette (L)_______ 217  mit (L)_______ 148  vorgeren (L)____ 93, 100, 212
brengen (L)_______ 93  nú (L)_______ 84  vorraden (L)____ 210
brust (L)____ 202, 208  ore (H)______ 64  vorsagen (L)____ 94
büssen (H)_____ 65  pfenning (H)____ 64  vorspellen (L)____ 210
dragen, dregen (L)____ 164  probist (H)____ 65  vorspillen (L)____ 210
dögen (L)______ 100  recht (L)____ 222  vorwerden (L)____ 210
gelden (L)______ 100  schenen (L)____ 125  vrêde (L)____ 153
geld (L)_______ 125  schulder (L)____ 222  viêren (L)____ 93
geschen (L)______ 100  schên (L)______ 125, 209  war, wor, wur (L)____ 74
gevallen (L)____ 100  silbur (H)____ 64, 65  werden (L)____ 100
geven (L)______ 125  sondag (L)____ 143  woldich (L)____ 208
heim (L)_______ 153  unde (H)______ 64  wor (L)_______ 84

Modern German

sollen__________ 179  ver______________ 210  vor______________ 210

Gothic

-ôns____________ 216  baur___________ 206  haimöśli__________ 200
aigan___________ 173  bindan__________ 40  run gauarkjan______ 199
alhs____________ 161  brusts___________ 202  runs__________ 199
bairan__________ 40  fadar___________ 39  runs blôbis______ 199
barn___________ 206  fidwortaibun______ 220
INDEX 263

Greek

δρόμος ______ 199  ὁμάω ______ 199
πατήρ ______ 39  ῥύσις τοῦ αἵματος ______ 199

Old Icelandic

-fim(n)i ______ 198  brigzl ______ 123 215  eng ______ 185
-ligr ______ 199  brjóst ______ 202 203  engi ______ 185
-naðr ______ 205  brjósthell ______ 202  ertog, ørtug ______ 184
ágríp ______ 202  brjóta ______ 8 202  eta ______ 10 204
aldr ______ 199  brók ______ 184  etja ______ 118
allr ______ 126 207  brotfall ______ 200  eyja ______ 37
alls ______ 202  braþa ______ 216  fadir ______ 39
allskonar ______ 202  brúargerð ______ 216  faðla ______ 217
allstaðar ______ 202  burr ______ 206  falla ______ 126
allsvalandi ______ 207 208  burt ______ 216  fé ______ 10
allsvöldugr ______ 207 208  byrd, hurdr ______ 196  felling ______ 217
andeardæ ______ 168  byrðr, byrði ______ 197  ferð ______ 162
annarr ______ 126 175 176 193  býti ______ 85  festa ______ 11
armleggr ______ 206  bádi ______ 164  fimmtán ______ 127 128
armr ______ 206  dagsverk ______ 185  fimmti ______ 127
atburðr ______ 197  dauðr ______ 9  fjórir ______ 220
atmáli ______ 17  dótir ______ 115  fjórtán, fjogurtán ______ 219 220
áttundi ______ 201  draga ______ 163  flestr ______ 203
augnaheill ______ 202  drjagr ______ 202  flot ______ 203
báðir ______ 164  dróttinn ______ 115  floti ______ 203
barn ______ 10 206  drykkja ______ 216  folk ______ 168
beita ______ 123  drykkr ______ 216  for_______ ______ 210
beizl ______ 123  duga ______ 172  forboð ______ 210
bella ______ 211  dóna ______ 10  fordúðskapr ______ 210
bera ______ 221  eda ______ 211  forfall ______ 210
berfóstr ______ 202  efni ______ 128  forliðinn ______ 201
berr ______ 221  eiga ______ 160, 172, 173  förmál ______ 200 210
betr ______ 199  eign ______ 160  fóten ______ 202
betri ______ 199  einn ______ 188  framleidd ______ 197
borgan ______ 216  ek ______ 10  freista ______ 203
bregða ______ 215 216  eldr ______ 178  fyllr ______ 168 169
brigða ______ 215  ella ______ 211  fundarlaun ______ 203
| fundr     | 166 | bǫfuð      | 10 | liða     | 201 |
| fylla    | 169 | bǫgga      | 119 | lífna    | 128 |
| fyr(ir)- | 210 | holt       | 169 | jós      | 9   |
| fjirðjóða | 210 | hórdómr    | 126 | margr    | 221 |
| fyrirverða | 168, 210 | bón     | 10 | mega     | 172 |
| fyr      | 217 | hróp       | 213 | mengi    | 221 |
| fyri     | 217 | humli     | 127 | mjólk    | 10  |
| Færeyjar | 37  | húnn      | 204 | mólka    | 168 |
| gamall   | 127 | hvárgi(n) | 218 | mjörk    | 189 |
| gera     | 177 | hváriki    | 218 | munu     | 172 |
| geta     | 200 | hvárr      | 167 | mála     | 10  |
| getask   | 200 | hvrr       | 168 | nafn     | 128 |
| geyma    | 198 | hvítta     | 217 | nátt, nótt | 115 |
| geynsla  | 198 | hvítta     | 217 | nefna    | 128 |
| gjalda   | 169, 208 | hvitill  | 217 | neisa    | 197 |
| gneista  | 208 | hæð       | 222 | neita    | 219 |
| golf     | 168 | hálr       | 204 | nekkverr | 177 | 178 |
| gripa    | 202 | háttar     | 115 | niðr     | 197 |
| gripr    | 202 | hlið       | 197 | niðra    | 197 |
| gull     | 169 | intekt, -tekð | 206 | nérkominn | 128 |
| gullhlað | 169 | jafni      | 128 | ofheldi  | 211 |
| gézla    | 122, 125 | ját(t)la  | 219 | ofdrykkja | 223 |
| gázla    | 122, 125 | jǫrd      | 10  | óndverðr | 168 |
| hald     | 200 | kaupa      | 162 | óp       | 213 |
| hamarr   | 126 | ker        | 221 | opinn    | 166 |
| hann     | 158 | kná        | 172 | orka     | 211 |
| hardbýstr | 202 | koltr      | 168 | orrusta  | 197 |
| bǫfnan   | 128 | koma       | 127 | rannsökun | 216 |
| bǫfnad   | 129 | korn       | 5   | reiði    | 11  |
| helg     | 178 | kristindómr | 127 | rétt     | 10  | 115 |
| bér      | 11  | láð        | 222 | rykkja   | 213 |
| heri     | 220 | lamb       | 11  | sannr    | 126 |
| heyra    | 8   | láta       | 166 | sátr    | 115 |
| blad     | 222 | laust      | 166 | séa, sája | 10  |
| blaupa   | 204 | leg        | 217 | segja    | 162 |
| blaustigr | 204 | leggja     | 120 | sein(a)st | 214 |
| bnykkja  | 213 | leynd      | 28  | seinnn   | 214 |
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Modern Icelandic

Latin
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>alias_</td>
<td>97, 99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David_</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dēbitum</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fēstivālis</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>id est_</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judas_</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nātālis_</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patēr_</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositus</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>septem_</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sīmon_</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tertius_</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nātālis_</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>patēr_</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prepositus</td>
<td>149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>septem_</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>videre_</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Latvian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>klēts_</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mūsa, muša_</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lithuanian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>klė́tis_</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mūsė, musià_</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Old Norwegian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>betala_</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fyndr_</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nykkja_</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rinda_</td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Modern Norwegian**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>brok_</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>huta_</td>
<td>201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neit(t)a_</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Proto-Germanic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-iðō_</td>
<td>205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-ōniz_</td>
<td>216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aigan-</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aihti-</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alb-</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anda-wardōjan-</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>arut(i)-taugō-</td>
<td>184</td>
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-in, -it_________189  | bregha_________215  | fērī-_________162 |
-liker, -ligher____199  | brīgha_________215  | festa_________11 |
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alls_________202  | beldi_________211  | göma_________198 |
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barn_________10  | fiūrir_________220  | huarghin_________218 |
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| iak | 10 | nifra | 197 | üttlifin | 201 |
| iaka | 219 | öp | 213 | vangömsla | 198 |
| intækt | 206 | rifa | 193 | vara | 11 | 183 |
| iorh | 10 | rogher, rugher | 10 | vīr | 10 | 183 |
| kar | 221 | röp | 213 | vreþe | 11 |
| kasi | 116 | röva | 161 | vriþa | 11 |
| kasnavargher | 116 | run | 199 | verold | 17 |
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| leggbēn | 206 | skapi, skēpi | 165 | ata | 10 |
| manger | 221 | skē | 209 | ortugh, ortogh | 184 |
| margher | 221 | skula | 11 | þar | 220 |
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| mǣlan | 138 | snīmma | 214 | þiðti, þiþ- | 205 |
| mǣla | 10 | staþer | 10 | þiðtr, þiþ- | 205 |
| nēka | 119 | stēn | 9 | þorva | 183 |
| nektia | 119 | stūnka, stinka | 10 | þrka | 9 |
| nēta | 119 | taka | 193 | þän | 152 |

**Modern Swedish**

<p>| ag | 158 | förleden | 201 | håll | 200 |
| alls | 202 | förra | 217 | intäkt | 206 |
| antvarda | 168 | giftermålsbalk | 84 | kase | 116 |
| Antvarden | 168 | giftobalk | 84 | komma | 158 |
| balk | 80 | gotländska | 3 | kristnabalk | 80 |
| brok | 184 | gutamål | 8 | kvar | 168 |
| bröst | 202 | gutniska | 9 | kyrbalk | 80 |
| bygningabalk | 86 | gäst | 23 | led | 158 |
| bädd | 199 | gömma | 198 | ljus | 132 |
| dag | 158 | gōra | 158 | manhelgesbalk | 83 |
| denne | 138 | hur | 204 | medan | 138 |
| fred | 158 | huru | 204 | mången | 221 |
| fredsbalk | 82 | huta | 201 | ned | 201 |
| fā | 23 | hāl | 204 | nedan | 201 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Word</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>senast</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svära</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>svård</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sälja</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>till</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tingbalk</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tjuvbalk</td>
<td>87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>torsdag</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>tvär</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var(je)</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vara</td>
<td>168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>varken</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>var</td>
<td>180</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vilken</td>
<td>218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>äga</td>
<td>173</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vittne</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>åfadbalk</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vän ta</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>år</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>vär d</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>värk</td>
<td>168</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UBB Ms. 58</td>
<td>20, 26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Runic Inscriptions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DR 373</th>
<th>181</th>
<th>G 99</th>
<th>220</th>
<th>†G 186</th>
<th>22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>G 100</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>†G 187</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 9</td>
<td>168</td>
<td>G 107a</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>G 249</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 21</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>G 119</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>G 269</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 33</td>
<td>206</td>
<td>G 121</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>G 309</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 36</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>†G 129</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>G 322</td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 70</td>
<td>189</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>G 158</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>G 325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 78</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>G 163</td>
<td>120</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G 98</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>G 170</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>U 614</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Manuscripts of *Guta lag*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Shelfmark</th>
<th>Siglum</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Contents</th>
<th>Language</th>
<th>Material</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AM 54 4to</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1587</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Gutish</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM 55 4to</td>
<td>D</td>
<td>mid 16th</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 64</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>mid 14th</td>
<td>GL, GS</td>
<td>Gutnish</td>
<td>parchment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 65</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1401-1408</td>
<td>GL, GS, Edicts</td>
<td>German, Danish</td>
<td>parchment, paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B 68</td>
<td>D₁</td>
<td>early/mid 17th</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Danish</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GKS 3363</td>
<td>B₁</td>
<td>17th/18th</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Gutnish, Latin</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kall 650</td>
<td>B₂</td>
<td>17th/18th</td>
<td>GL</td>
<td>Gutnish</td>
<td>paper</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A.1: Manuscripts of *Guta lag*
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Appendix B

Chapters of *Guta lag*

Below is an overview of the chapters of *Guta lag* with the order and division in Codex B as the point of departure. The rubric in Codex B is first given in **bold** (complete with chapter number) followed by the corresponding title in the table of contents on 55v-57v, given in parentheses ( ). The right square bracket ] separates Codex B from the other recensions, given in the order A G D. For Codices A and D both the rubric and title in the table of contents are given, the latter in parentheses ( ). A division sign ÷ indicates a rubric is missing; when the entire chapter is missing, the division sign is followed by *chapter* in italics.

0 Hier byrias Gutha Lagh  ] 1. Hier byrias lagh guta oc segia so at fyrstum (Hier byrias fyrstum) A; i. Hir bigynnet sich der goten recht van deme lande Godlande G; i. Her beginnis gullands Lou (I Indgang till lowffuen) D.


2. **Aff tiont** (2. Aff tiont + 2. Leyger du aker ella engh) ] 3. aff tiunt (Af tiunt) A; iii. van dem czenden G; iii. Af tint (III Om Tindt) D.

3. **Aff Blotan** (3. Aff Blotan) ] 4. af blotan (Af blotan) A; iii. Van apgotlicher an betunge G; Af Blotan (÷) D.


5. **Aff helgom dagom** (5. Aff helgom dagom) ] 6. Af helgum daghum (Af helgum dagum) A; v. van den heilighen tagen G; v. Om helge dage (V Om helligdage) D.
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6. Aff munka rethi  (6. Aff munka rethi) ] 7. af munca aigum (af munca aigum) A; vi. dis ist van monchen G; vi. Om naagen hugger skog for munke (Om nogenn hugger skouff for munke) D.


8. Aff AllA manna fridi  (8. Aff alla manna fridi) ] af aldra manna friþi (Af aldra manna friþ) A; van aller manne vrede G; alle mands fridt (VIII Om Alde mande fredt) D.

9. Aff waar fridi  (Aff waar fridi) ] Af warfriþi (Af war friþi) A; An vrede der lenczen G; om vardfridt (IX Om wardfridt) D.

10. Aff Tinghs fridi  (10. Aff Tinghs fridi) ] af þingfriþi (Af þingfriþi) A; Van dinghe vrede G; Aff ting fridt († om Tingfredt) D.

11. Aff heim fridi  (11. Aff heim fridi) ] Af haim friþi (Af haima friþi) A; Van hůs vrede G; Om hiem fridt (X Om hiemfridt) D.

12. Aff man drapi  (12. Aff mandrapi) ] af mandrapi (Af mandrapi) A; Van man slachtunge G; Aff mandrab (XII Om mandraff) D.


15. Aff werildi manna  (15. Aff werildi manna) ] af wereldi manna (Af wereldum manna) A; van busse der manne G; Aff mannþ boot (XIII Om mandebodt) D.

16. Aff Bandu werildi  (16. Aff Bandu werildi) ] af banda wereldi (Af banda wereldum) A; van būsse der vrede Bende G; Aff frihedz boodt (XV Om frihedzbodt) D.

17. Aff osoydom  (17. Aff osoydom) ] aff o soyþum (af osoyþom) A; Van vndyren van pferdin. van ochsin van hunden. vnde van bern G; Aff vuant fæe (XVI Om Wuant Æ) D.
18. Ber mader kuno (18. Ber mader kuno) ber maþr cunu (af berþri cuna) A; Sleyt eyn man eyn wip G; Om mandt slaar quinne (XVII Om nogen slaer quinne att barn forfaris) D.
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÷ ] ÷ AG; Aff barns foruaring (XVIII Om Barns foruaring) D.

19. Aff sara farom (19. Aff Sara farom) af sarum (af sarum) A; van den wunden G; Om nogen bliffuer saar giordt (XIX Om nogenn bliffuer Saar) D.

20. Aff loyski (20. Aff Loyski) ÷ AGD.

21. Scheinir tu kledi mans (21. Scheinir tu kledi mans) ÷ AGD.

22. Aff ypno sari oc lukahaggom (22. Aff ypno sari) ÷ AGD.

23. Gier mader manni weghtuerra (23. Gier mader mannj wegtuerra) ÷ AGD.

24. Bers trell (24. Bers trell) ÷ A; Van deme drellen G; Om en madz trel bliffuer slagen (XX Om en mands trell bliffuer Slagen) D.

25. Aff Allom Lutom (25. Aff allom lutom) af allum lutum (af lutum) A; Van Erb gute G; Om faderløse børn som kallis oformage (XXI Om faderlosse Børn) D.

26. Thar som gangs i Gardi (26. Thar som gangs i gardi) ÷ AGD.

‘Hogsl. oc id.’ (÷) ÷ AD; høgsl oc ḳ G.

27. Aff Qwinna Lutom (27. Aff qwinna lutom) ÷ AD; van erbgud der wibe G.

28. Aff Thy Barn (28. Aff Thybarn) ÷ AD; ‘van vnechte kinder’ G.


30. Aff hori (30. Aff hori) gierir mandr hor (af hor carllum) A; Tút eyn Man obir spil ‘Aff Horj: 26’ G; Om hoor sag (XXIII Om haandsag) D.

31. Warder kuna schemd a wegom (31. Warder kuna schemd á wegom) ‘af quinna scam’ (af quinna scam) A; wirt eyn wip geschenet G; Om nogen quinne bliffuer skemdt y skoog (XXIII Om Quinde bliffuer krenkitt y skou) D.

32. Aff Qwinna Gripom (32. Aff qwinna Gripom) vm quinna gripj (af quinna gripum) A; van grifen der wibe G; vm quinne grip (XXV Om Quinde Tegt) D.
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33. **Aff wagnikla ferdir** (33. Aff wagnickla ferdir) ] af bryllaupum (af bryþlaupum) A; Van brültachten G; Aff vagnikla ferdar (XXVI Om Brudferdt) D.

34. **Aff Erfis gierdom** (34. Aff erffis Gierdom) ] ‘lag erfs gernd’ (af erfs gierþum) A; van Begennkisse G; Om arffue at gøre eftter dødt folck (XXVII Om Jordeferdt) D.

35. **Aff Qwinna ret** (35. Aff quwinna ret) ] af quinna ret (÷) A; ÷ chapter G; Om quinne ret er saadan lou (LXXIII Om quinde rett) D.

÷ ] ÷ (af scarþøi) A; ÷ chapter G; Aff skarlagen oc blaadrect (XXVIII Om Skarlagen och bloddregt) D.

÷ ] ÷ (af raiþcleþum) A; ÷ chapter G; Om ridklede oc høginde (÷) D.

36. **Aff Gutnischi kuno** (36. Aff Gutnischki kuno) ] ÷ (af gutniscum cunum) A; van gothnischen wiben G; vngullants quinne (XXVIII Om gullandtz quinder) D.

En om ogutnisch folck (÷) ] ÷ (af ogutniscu fulki) A; van vngothnischen volke G; vgullandsk folck (XXX Om wdenlandzfolck) D.

37. **Aff farwegom** (37. Aff farwegom) ] Af farweghum manz (af farwegum mannz) A; van varweghen ‘NB. abest in mssto antiquo’ G; ÷ chapter D.

38. **Aff schoga bregdan** (38. Aff scoga bregdan) ] af scoga brigzlum (af scoga brigslum) A; van czweytracht der holczinge G; om skog (XXXI Om Skouff) D.

39. **Aff half gieri** (39. Aff halff Gierdi) ] af half gierþi (af halfgierþi) A; van teylunge der czûne G; om halff gierde (XXXII Om halffgierde) D.

÷ (÷) ] ÷ AD; van qweke in genomen G.

40. **Hwar som haggel oyloyfis** (40. Hwar som hagger oyloyfis) ] ÷ AD; van bruchender bøm G.

÷ (÷) ] ÷ AD; van holcze G.

41. **Aff Saudi** (41. Aff Saudi) ] af sauþi (af sauþi) A; van eyme Sode G; Aff Brynne (XXXIII Om Brynde) D.

42. **Aff eygna kaupi** (42. Aff Eygna kaupi) ] aff aigna caupi (af aigna caupi) A; van koufe des lant gutes G; om egitt køff om eigedom (XXXIII Om køff och Eygedom) D.
43. **Siter mader i hers handom** (Siter mader i hers handom) ] ÷ AG; Om mand sider y hershaandt (XXXV Om mand sider y hershandt) D.

‘farer Bondi y kisbafard’ (The en gangu biers eynom til handa, frammar than androm) ] ÷ AGD.

44. **Aff Gutnisch mans syni** (44. Aff Gutnisch mans syni] ‘aff b00 brythr’ (÷) A; ∖ G; ÷ D.

45. **Aff Geldom** (45. Aff Geldom] aff gieldum (af gieldum) A; van schûlden G; om gieldt (XXXVI Om Gieldt) D.

46. **Aff wediom** (46. Aff wediom] af ueþium (af weþium) A; van pfanden G; om borgen (XXXVII Om Borgen) D.

47. **Aff tingom** (47. Aff tingom] af þingum (af þingum) A; van dynge G; om ting (XXXVIII Om Ting) D.

48. **Aff fear kraffui** (48. Aff fear kraffui] af fear crafi (af fear crafi) A; vmme gut us czu manende G; om peninge (XXXIX Om gouds att indkreffue) D.

49. **Aff manna kaup** i (49. Aff manna kaupi] ÷ (af cauptum mannij) A; Koustu eynen man G; Køber du mandt (XL Om att køffue mandt eller folk) D.

50. **Aff yxna kaupi** (50. Aff yxna kaupi] caupir þu uxa (af cauptu um uksa) A; van eyme ochsen G; Om nogen køber vxe (XLI Om nogen køffuer Vxe) D.

**Kaupir thu ko** (÷) ] ÷ (af cauptri ko) A; van eyner kû G; Om naagen køber koo (Om nogen køffuer Koe) D.

51. **Aff hesta kaupi** (51. Aff Hesta kaupi] caupir þu hest (Af cauptum hestj) A; van eyme pferde G; Køffuer du hest (XLIII Om du køffuer nogen hest) D.

52. **Rider tu annan mans hest** (52. Rider tu annan mans hest) ] Af hestj (Af hestatext) A; Jtem G; Thager tu nogen mandz hest (XLIIV Om nogen tager mandtz hest) D.

53. **Aff schipa gezlu** (53. Aff schipa Gezlu] Af schipa getzlu (Af scipa gezlum) A; van bewarunghe der schiffe G; ÷ chapter D.

54. **Aff Ransakan** (54. Aff Ransakan] af ransacan (Af ranzaki) A; van hûs súchinge G; Om ransagen (XLV Om Randsagen) D.

55. **Aff Tiaufa Rethi** (55. Aff tiaufa Rethi] af þiaufa reth (Af þiaufa reth) A; van den dyben G; Om tyffue rett (XLVI Om Tiuffuerrett) D.
Stiel trell mans (饧) \smallsection{chapter} AD; van eyme drelle G.

56. Aff Oquedins ord (56. Aff oqwedins ord) ] af oqueþins orþum (Af oqueþins orþum) A; van vnlüdelichen wortin G; Om vbequemlig oc skentzel ordt (XLVII Om Schensels ordt) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om gulladt (XLVIII Om Gulladt) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om pennisg øl (XLIX Om Pennings øll) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om vaardt (L Om Wardt) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Boot om træ som hugger vden staurs (LI. Om en hugger y mandz Skou) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om træ boot innen stauers (饧) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om vidt (饧) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om mands lidt (LII Om lidt) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Aff dør (LIII hugger mand y Andens dør) D.

\smallsection{chapter} AG; Om stuck eller stødt (饧) D.

57. Aff Sma filedi `omercht' (Aff Sma filedi omercht) ] Af `s`ma f(i)leþj (Af o mer-ctu smafileþi) A; van vngemerkten cleynen vie G; Om vmerckt boskaff (LIII Om wmarkt fæ och boskaff) D.

58. Aff swinom (58. Aff Swinom) ] af suinum (Af svinu m) A; van den Swynen G; Aff Suin (LV Om Suin) D.

59. Aff Bolambum (59. Aff Bolmabum) ] af bolambum (Af bo lambum) A; van vorbysterden schafen G; bo vbkend (LVII Om fremmedt lam) D.

60. Aff fastom weduri (60. Aff fastom weduri) ] af fastum weþurj ocliptum (Af fastum veþuri o cliptum) A; van vngelubbeden wedderen vnde vngeclipped G; om vgilt væder oc vklifft (LVII Om weder) D.

61. Aff kliptom weduri (61. Aff kliptom wedurj) ] af fastum weþurj cliptum (Af fastum veþuri cliptum) A; ÷ G; ÷ (饧) D.

63. Aff nautom oc Russom (63. Aff nautom oc Russum) ] ÷ (Af nautum oc russum) A; van Rinderen vn̄de pferden G; Om nød oc ros (LIX Om nødt och Rus) D.

64. Aff Amerki (64. Aff amerki) ] af merki (Af a merki) A; van vntmerkinghe G; om nogen formercker for noge (LX Om nogen formerker for nogitt) D.

65. Aff Akrom (65. Aff Akrom) ] af acrum (Af acrum) A; van ackeren G; om agre (LXI Om Agre) D.

66. Aff Rofu Akrom (66. Aff Rofu Akrom) ] af rofnacrum (Af rofn acrum) A; van Røbin ackir G; Om roffue ager (LXX Om Roffue ager) D.

67. Aff haffreki (67. Aff Haffreki) ] af afreki (Af hafreki) A; van haf wrake G; Om haff vrack (LXII OM haff wragh) D.

68. Aff Eldi (68. Aff Eldi) ] af eldi (Af eldi) A; van vûre G; Om ildt (LXIII Om ildt) D.

69. Aff Bieru Eldi (69. Aff Bieru Eldi) ] af bieru eldi (Af bieru eldi) A; van vûre czu holende G; Aff bære ild (LXIII Om berre Ildt) D.

70. Aff Broan (70. Aff Broan) ] af broa gierþ (Af broa gerþ) A; van besserunge der wege G; Om at bygge bror (LXXII Om broer at byge) D.

71. Aff Schuti (71. Aff Schuti) ] af scutj (Af scuti) A; van geschosse G; ÷ chapter D.

72. Aff Wardi (72. Aff wardi] af warþi (af warþi) A; van waarde G; Om vaardt (LXIII Om wardt) D.

73. Aff husom oc hus tiaudom (73. Aff husom oc hus tiaudom) ] af husum oc hus þiauþum (Af husum oc hus þiauþum) A; van hûseren G; Om hus oc husfolck (LXXI Om husfolk) D.

÷ (÷) ] ÷ AD; van hûs dyben G.

74. Aff Byrslu folki (74. Aff Byrslu folcki) ] af byrslu fulki (Af byrgslu fulki) A; van volke in der arne G; Om arbez folck (LXIX Om Arbedtz folk) D.

75. Aff sædalausu folki (75. Aff sædalausu folcki) ] ÷ (Af seþa lausu fulki) A; van volke das nicht bûwet G; ÷ D.

76. Aff ikornum (76. Aff ikornom) ] af icornum (af i cornum) A; van grownen tyrechyn G; Om igerne iact (LXV Om Jgerne Jagt) D.
77. Aff harum (77. Aff Harum) ] af herum (Af herum) A; van hazin G; Om hare (LXVI Om hare Jagt) D.

78. Aff schaffli (78. Aff schaffli) ] af scaflj (Af scaflj) A; van obisse G; Aff skaffel oc fruct (LXVII Om Skauel och frugt) D.

79. Aff messo fallom (79. Aff messo fallom) ] af messu falli (Af messu falli) A; van gebreche der messen G; Om messe fal (LXVIII Om Messe faldt) D.

80. Aff duffli (80. Aff duffli) ] af duflj (Af duflj) A; van dopil spil G; Om daabel (LXXIII Om doblerri) D.

81. Aff Burgan wider byamen (81. Aff Burgan wider byamen) ] ÷ AD; ÷ chapter G.

82. Vm schoga (82. Um schoga oc festu Eigur allar) ] vm scogha (÷) A; ÷ chapter G; Vm skoge (LXXVI Om Skøge) D.
Appendix C

Editorial principles

The following critical edition of *Guta lag* (§[D]) is based off the manuscript Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 54 4to (‘Codex B’) and supplies variant readings from the three collateral manuscripts. Nothing has been corrected in the text but is instead reproduced as in the manuscript, with correct readings given in the first critical apparatus with the label *leg.* ‘read’. Corrections made by the scribe (David Bilefeld) are given in their corrected form in the main text, with the original or deleted form given in the first apparatus, labeled *del.* ‘deleted’. Marginal notes and above-line insertions are given in the main text when they form a part of the text; otherwise they are also given in the first apparatus, labeled *in marg. add.* ‘added in the margin’ or *sup. lin. add* ‘added above the line’.

Readings from the three collateral manuscripts are given in the second apparatus followed by a siglum for the manuscript. The manuscripts and their sigla are:

A  Stockholm, Royal Library, B 64 (‘Codex A’)

G  Stockholm, Royal Library, B 65

D  Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 55 4to

Readings not found in Codex B are given in the main text in angled brackets ⟨ ⟩ and written in *italics*. The siglum for the manuscript from which the reading is taken is written immediately following the opening bracket, except in the case of Codex A, which is left unmarked.

The readings included in the apparatus may not always be self-evident, but have been chosen in connection with the present study.

The symbols used in the edition follow the practice of [Stefán Karlsson (1963)](1963), though not all symbols are used. Line and page breaks are not indicated, although folio numbers are given in the right margin near the page break in the manuscript. Abbreviations are expanded in *italics*, though non-specific abbreviation markers (points, etc.) are given in parentheses ⟨ ⟩, e.g. “mann” for “mān” but “S(ífr)” for
“S.” Above-line additions are indicated with inward-facing addition markers `´ and marginal additions with outward-facing ``, while deletions are indicated with deletion markers ¦ ¦. Illegible text is indicated with the digit 0, with the number of digits corresponding to the assumed number of illegible characters.

These same editorial principles apply to the transcription of Kong Hans’ recess [King John’s ordinances] from 1492 and a fragment of Kong Christians recess [King Christian’s ordinances] from 1537, both found in the manuscript Stockholm, Royal Library, B 65 (Appendix E), though no variant readings are given from other manuscripts.
Appendix D

A Critical edition of Guta Lag

¶ Hier Byrias Gutha Lagh.

1. Thitta ier fyrst vphoff i laghum warom, Ath wir schulum neytha, heydnu, oc iatta krisno. ¶ ok troa allir a an gud Alzwaldugan, oc allir han Bidia, thet han vnnj os aar oc friid, sigher och heydnu, och thett att wir maghin halda cristindome warom, oc thro wari rette, oc landj waro Bygdu, och wir maghin huar dagh thet sysla y allom gerningom eptir wilia warom som Gudj syer tokkelighet, och war sy mest tarff ⟨at⟩ Bade till liif och siell:

Aff Barnom

1.
Thitta ier nw thi nest, at barn hwart scal Alas, som fyt wader a lande waro, och ey wt kasta: 

[10] Tha witha skal hwarioc kon a sengh sina, tha en haan i barn farom legger. fai med sir withniss kunur twar, griþkunu och grankunu, at barn warj dath burith, oc ey gingham hennar handa werk till: 


[30] En kumber maal vp fyjr alla ly RK, och warder than en sidhan at sannu, tha lauper thet y xii M(arkr) wider land Alt. 

Haffuir haan ey fe ath Byta, tha flyi land, och liggia hwariom manni iij. M(arkr) wider som hana hysir, heymer ella math geffuir. 

[35] Tha en haan gripkuunu | leg. griþkunu | werk | del. werk | secht | leg. sett | ‘tha’ | del. | sicht | leg. sycht | than | leg. han

[40] Thitta | Pet A; Det D. 

[45] barn hwart scal Alas, som fyt wader | huert thet barn som aarde oc først bliffuer fad D. 

[50] hwart | huert A. 

[55] Alas | ala A. 

[60] warer | verþr A. 

[65] waro | oru A. 

[70] ey wt kasta | icke forskade eller forskunde aðfææsl D. 

[75] ey | ecki A. 

[80] witha skal hwarioc kon | fordi skal huer quinne vid D. 

[85] hwarioc | hueriu A. 

[90] en | þann

[95] sic A. 

[100] legger | ligg A. 

[105] fai med sir withniss kunur twar | at hon haffuer sin vitnissbyrdt med siig: som ere tuo quinne D. 

[110] gripkuunu och grankunu | Gritkone oc grankone, det er nabokone oc iordemoder D. 

[115] gripkuunu | griþ cunu A. 

[120] at | et A. 

[125] oc ey gingham hennar handa werk till | vnde (h)ende des onschuldig syn G; at thet icke komne till aff hennis handeuerck och gerning; eller af hennis handegerning D. 

[130] Tha | a ‘pa’ A. 

[135] frels kono | frels quinne: det er en ectequin D. 

[140] Barne spilt | forsplot oc forkomot sit fostir D. 

[145] kumbir | cumbr A. 

[150] þikku men | þikku men A; des dynghes manne G; tingsmenne D. 

[155] vntan thi at eyns, at | vntan þi at ains et A. 

[160] haffui fyri | secht maal scriptat | hafy script sett aat; haan haffuer bestaat opbenbarlig D. 

[165] fyr | fyr A. 

[170] secht | sett A. 

[175] Bierz henne | Oc henni bieri A. 

[180] madher | ‘maðr’ A. 

[185] innj | vinner D. 

[190] En enghin madher eygher tar a sakum | y thet hon haffuer thet fyr set som opbenbarlig D. 

[195] sett | et A. 

[200] hafdj | hafij A. 

[205] sochnin | dis bøde sogne iii marck D. 

[210] man | mannun A. 

[215] Tha en | Pa A. 

[220] wardher | urþr A. 

[225] fwl | skidin oc fuul D. 

[230] tha Byti haan iij marker sochn | da þade sogni iir marck D. 

[235] iij | þriar A. 

[240] soch | sochnin

[245] en sochnin winder sicht | ÷ G. 

[250] sochnin | sochen A. 

[255] sicht | syc A. 

[260] tings men | des dyngh G. 

[265] iij | þriar A. 

[270] marker | ÷ A. 

[275] sannu | san A. 

[280] warder | verþr A. 

[285] Alla lydhí | des ganze land G. 

[290] warder | urþr A. 

[295] than | han A. 

[300] sannu | san A. 

[305] thet | ÷ A. 

[310] xii | tolf A. 

[315] land Alt. | landa alla A; das ganze land G; alt lannit D. 

[320] Haffuir | ‘hår A. 

[325] fe | gotz och fææ D. 

[330] och liggia hwariom ... ella math geffuir | vnde keyn man sal sy høsen ader spisen by iij Marc G. 

[335] liggi | liggi rÝ Y A. 

[340] hwariom | hueriu A. 

[345] iij. | þriar A. 

[350] heymer | þpa hainir A; eller hienner D. 

[355] math gefuir | þpa henni mat gief A; eller henne giffue matt D. 

[360] Tha en | Endog D. 

[365] en | þen sic A.
will ey till eyds at ganga, tha ier haan than fwl, och fald at thj malj. Gangha oc hinir ather mals som henne sak kendo, och wilia ey fe fram leggia tha schulu men hana sakluasa dyoma och scyra thes mals. ¶ En theyr symin hana, med eydom, oc takin henne ordh aff bakj som a sagdu. ¶ Tha en haan ganger wider, at haan moder war oc kallar barn wara dath burrith, ta tarff ey hennj fe fram leggia. En men wilia henne mistroa om, oc engar hafuer haan taar witnis konur wider, som medh henne waro ta en haan i Barnfarom war: ¶ Tha en Ambatn mans wardher slicht mal kenth, tha leggir engin henne meyra fe fram than vj. oyrur < penninga >, ta en haan warder fwl, tha Bythi drotin fyri hana < siec oyrur penninga >, oc leggi a Bak henne vy wintra sidhan mal ier wti.

**Aff tjonnt**

2. Thet ier nu thi nest, at thar eygir hwar thider hafua, oc tjonnt til fyra, som han kyrkiu garra, oc boll war aff andwardu til schurat, Than prestir eygir fyrj hanom allan kristindom at weyta, hwat som wider tarfar arla ella sida: ¶ So ieru allir men om satir, at fyrj mario Messu i fastu schal hwar mader tjonnt sina haffua fram reydda, Bade lerdom mannj sin luta och kyrkin sen ¶ i Rauki eygir hwar mader tjonnt. ¶ Tha ma engin thet seghia fyirir, at tjonnt si ey berdh sidhan maria messa komber.

---

2. del. 3. 29 kyrkin | leg. kyrkiu
En eptern maria messo ta schal prestar lysa om tria sunnoddagha, en a fiarda kyrkiu durom ather luka, oc tidher heptata fyri kyrkio mannom, til ⟨bes⟩ thima at tioitier all fram reydi, oc iij M(arke) fylgia aff theym mannj som ey wildi ⟨fyri⟩ tioit sira fram reyda. ¶ Thetta eyga allir sykia saman, oc allir eygha ⟨at⟩ haftua, sochna men ey’g’ha triduingh, oc triduingh kirckia, och triduingh prestir. ¶ Tha en leygu lenningar far burt med tioit o guldinne fram yr kyrkiu sochn oc i Andra, tha sether han sick at iij M(arke) wider prest ⟨Oc kirchiu⟩, oc wider kyrkiu men, oc fyri than en tioit sira ater tan at sidhar si. ¶ Tha en naqaur wil sir kirkio gier, at meyra maki then han fyrra hafdi, tha schal han ‘giera’ aff niu lutom en tioit, tha schal iem wel kyrk’ia’haffua sin lut, som prestar sin, thar at hil nya ier wigd, en sidan ta scal han thar giffua tioit som Han ⟨kirchiu⟩ gierdi siinast, ey ma han sidan laupa ater til lornu tha en han andra haffuer gart nya. ¶ Oc ey ma han ganka fran hinne lorn ⟨Oc⟩ til nyo, sidan then a theym daghi som biscopter legdi wigslir a. ¶ Tha en theim takar schilia vm thegar, vm fyrra aar ella annat, tha schal sieluwer wita med eydi och kyrkio mannom tweim, som hiir nilia till nemnup, att han thar i gierd warj, oc i wigslum, oc i allom lutum so som andrir kyrkxiomen,. ¶ Tha en ⟨Fram⟩ iero gangsuir triir winter ella triim meyra tha schall han haffua bade kyrkio manna witmi, at han thar mid teym i gierd warj, oc prester si witni at han tioit haffui thar e sidhan hanom til fyrd so som hu har annar kyrkio man.

¶ Tha en madher leyger Aker, ella engh ’yr Annars kirkio sochn, oc ieru engin
hws a, tha schal hand seda tont quaarr leyffua, thar som Aker war til schurader, en hoy och humbla ta fyri heym, oc gefjuf th’ynn presti tont aff, som han sykir tidher <at>, oc allan kristindom aff taker. ¶ Tha en hws ieru a, tha schal alt qwart leyffua, haffui than prestir tont <af>, som thar at kirckio sitir, iam wel eygir thaim kirkia sin lut, som prestir sin.

**Aff Blotan**

Teth ier nw thi nest at bloot ier mannom mikit forbudit, oc fyrmsha all thaim som heydnau fylgir. ¶ Engin ma heyta hwaski a hult ella hauga, ella heydin gud, hwaski a wi ella staff garda, ¶ Tha en naqvar warder at thi sander, oc leydas hanom saa winij a hand, at han haffui heylz naqwar, tha mid mati ella mid drykky sinom som ey fylgia chrisnom sidi, tha ier han saker at iij. M(arkum) wider kyrkio men en teyr sycht winna, thitta eyga oc allir sykia saman oc <allir aigu> at haffua præster oc kyrkio och kyrkkiomen, ¶ Tha en werzl ier hanom a hendj, tha standi han fyri med vj. manna eydj, tha ier kyrkkiomen winna ey sycht, och komber yet vp fyri tings men, thar wers han en med vj. manna eydi, ella Byti iij. M(arkr) tingi, Tha en kumber vp fyri alla landa, tha Byti han xij. M(arkr) landj en han ey winder med eydij
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xij. manna fyrst standit

**Aff prestom och prest Barnom.**

Theth ier nw thy nest, at prestir och prest kona och prest barn lerd thaim ieru slích at slegh och drapi och at allom lutum som Bonda barn, ¶ En him olerrdu, thaim fylgin modur’ kyni sino, ¶ en sidan framleydis alt thet som tar aff kromber bade A qwindj och a keld’y, thia fylgir e gutnisku kynj, vtan thi at eyns, at han takj if[0000] werra oc nidrj so Byrd sina, thia ier och hans rether, slíker som Bonda ella bonda Barna: ¶ Tha en prest som olerder hitter sakar at giera ella man at wegha, thia siir han sielu’yr wider sakom e medan han liffuir, hwat som han er ier inna lands eller vtan; ¶ Hittir mader saker gierra lerder ella olerder, thay Bytj engin frammur (firi amnan) thay en hans kuster winder a’ar’t: Tha en han déyr oc liauther hin lerdj sakar, thia biaudj han boot thegar, fyrí thy at ey ma præster wider sakom sia, en hin si oschemder at taka tegar, en han wil, med thy at ey ier hinom ret ler dan man at wega, ella illan wilia wider han at haffua, ¶ Tha en han will ey boot at taka, thia schal biera a tingh fyrj alla lydj, takj tar en han wil ellar radin allir lyder fyrí Boot en si mader osaker. ¶ Tha en han hempn at eyger so Budit, thay Bytj Han at fullu werildj, och Alloom landom xl. M(arkr). ¶ Tha en tweir bryder liauta sakar annar lerder oc annar olerder, oc wil hin lerdj Byta, en olerdj wil ey, thay leggi hin lerdj fram hafud lut sen taka i hender som allar landar til nempna, oc hauffei helgh sidhan, en hin si wider sakom som ey wilid Boot biauda, ¶ Tha en werildj warder budhit, thay bytir hwar sen hafud luta. ¶ Tha en hin lerdj liauter at sakom sia, som ey ma hempnà, thay schal ‘han’ boot tegar taka som i Budi ier, ¶ Tha en han ey wil Boot taka, vtan wiil helder hempnà, thay skal hin bierra a tingh fyrj alla lydj, taki en tar en han wil, ellar radin their fyrir fe, oc mader si osaker. ¶ Tha en han wil ey lerdu mannj Boot i Budi haffua, thay skal han ganga a tingh fyrj alla lydj oc kera thar siit maal segandis, At iach ier lerdj mader, och til guds tiestitu wigdr, iach ma ey y haggom standa, ella i oristu, Boot wildj Jac taka en i Budi warj, en scham wildj Jac nauduger tula. ¶ Tha schulu landar a sia, noyda och man til hanom at Byta iem wel som han war noyder androm at byta, fyri thy so et hwat tima prester at sia sakom, ella wider sia sakom vtn kristindomber warder spiltir.

---
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**Aff prestom och prest Barnom**

af prestrom oc prest cunum oc [hæra barnum] A; Van pristeren G; Af prestorn oc prest konor oc deris børn D. ¶ 297 3r

[thaim] leg. thanun 80 [him] leg. hinn 80 thaim leg. thanun 84 som leg. sun 85 er leg. 87 liauther del. liauther 88 biauda del. biuda 97 liauter del. liuter 99 bierra leg. biera 100 fe del. fa 105 hwat leg. hwatki 105 tima leg. ma
Aff helgdom dagom.

Teth ier nw thy nest, at dagha eyga men alla helga halda ⟨pa⟩ som biscopor haffua helga Budhit, och allir ⟨menn⟩ haffua wider takit. ¶ Engin schal ⟨annat⟩ werck at giera, annat om sonrudagh ella annan helgan dag, vtan tider at haffua, oc gudtz tianistu ⟨at⟩ lyda, oc loff haffua ⟨at⟩ ridha vm Bo seth, sidhan messa ier sungin ella tider ieru haffdar. ¶ Ey ma mader meyra a wagni fyra vm sonrudagh than punds tungsta, epit xnya oyk, oc halfft epter hestj. ¶ Tha en meyra haffuir, tha ma halda lassj hans till vj. oyra, och than Byti han vj. oyra, fyrr helgis Brut vtan thi at eyns at naud synan till gangin, och lerder mader ⟨verði⟩ aat spyerd, tha ma han a sia hwat ⟨sum⟩ til trenger, och lufa i kirkiu sochn sennj, ⟨So⟩ at mader wardi ey tar ⟨clandaþr⟩ ella awitir vmgar,. ¶ Tha en widarj wil aka, tha leyti ⟨bann⟩ e wider than lerdan man fyrir sitt oor ⟨kirchiu⟩ sochn annar eygar wald, en han owiþhri wil wara. ¶ Til kaupungs ier mannj lufluat at fara, ella Akad, med garlakom madnadi, ustom oc smierj, ⟨fiskom⟩ ‘och’ allum mialk matj, ‘fiscum oc fughlum’ och soydum, theim som tha al a torghi selia, med Bakado Braudj och ey med mielj ella kornj, och ey medh waru andrj, vtan ⟨bann⟩ hetj wider badj lassi och vj. oyrom. ¶ Sak eyger halua than som taker, en halfua prestir och kirkiomen, their
125 som han tha war i stadin, tha en han med war takin, ¶ Tha en mader rider och 
reyder Byrdj, ta ma ey than man klanda ella sakan ‘vm’ giera en han sieluffir sither 
à bakj. ¶ Tha en han [i] ‘haffr’ ‘y’ tughi russ, ella leydir med Byrdj, tha ier Byrdh 
thaim tyk med Skielom, thegar som halffu pundj ier meira, och than fylgia en vj. 
Oyrar fyrir helgis Brut. ¶ Warder frels mader a werki takin, ella frels kona, vm 
søndag ella annan helgan dag, ta ier tycht werck thett allt som thaim tha i handom 
haffua, oc liggi ‘than’ wider vj. oyrva awitj fyrir helgis Brut. Thett eyger och halfft, 
than som taker, en halfft eyger præstir, och kyrckia oc kyrkiomen. ¶ Wardi Treet 
ella Ambatn mans vm helgan dagh a werkj takin, ta Byti drotin fyrj theim iij. oyrva; 
en thaim yrkin ‘fyri thaim’ tria winter eptir leygu malit ier int:

### Aff munka rethi.

135 Teth ier nu thy nest, en naqwar warder at thy sander at han hagger schoga fyrj 
munkom. ella garda nider legger, ella naqwat meyn gier wider tha, ella wid eygner 
theira, tha ligger hanom wider ban. och Boot halffu meyra than Bonda millan, och 
haffui Byt fyrj thet fyrsta tingh, som tar warder nest eptir. ¶ Tha en tings at bidar 
tha liggia wider landa sak iij. M(arkr) och Byti hannom at laghom than et sidar sei.
Aff mans helgh

Teth ier nw thy nest att mans helg eyger standa vm daga ⟨pha⟩ alla som helgir ieru
fran thy eth sool setir vm affton ⟨oe⟩, til thes att lysir et tridia dygrī. ¶ fiugurtan
dagar i iauolm ieru i fridh tachnir, siaw wikur i faʃtu, och all pascha wika, tririā
gangdagar, oc all helgdaga wika. ¶ Drepir thu man a theim fridj, thy Byter thu
iij. M.(arkr). ¶ Sargar thu man Byt xij. oyra. ¶ Slar thu man med stangu ella yxar
hambri, Byt vj. oyra. ¶ Rykir thu mand, ella Rinder, ella i haar taker, ella ‘med’
neffua slaar, tha Byt iiij. oyra en i reydi ier gart. ¶ fyrrir treel Bytir ey frammar en iiij.
oyra: en han Blodought gier: ¶ Thar schal e Byta som gart ier, och ey thar som hin
ier som gieri. ¶ præster eyger tider hepta, oc kirckio durom ather luka fyri allom
theim, som gudshelg haffua Bruttid, med thy ath e fylgir ban helgis Britj: . ¶
Tha


sinnj] iorþ aign sennj A; syme land gute G; sin iord oc sin eige D. [146] nidiar luffui] ym vůlbort
gebin syne rechten erbannen G; ther er slectens oc frenders loff oc velie D. [146] luffui] lufin
A. [147] Aff mans helgh] af mann helgh A; van dem man vrede G; Af mands helgin huor lenge
gang dage D. [151] helgduda wika] woehe czu pfyngesten G; hellig dag vge, det er Pintz vge
der kirchen tør czu sliessen vnde dy czit hynderen G. [156] tider] þiðr A; tiðer oc guds tieniste D.
[157] helgis Bruttj] al sulchen brochen G.
schal yr Bannj sla, thegar so ier Byt som lagh seghia, oc kirkiomannom tykker Rad wara. ¶ Allir eyga sak sykia saman, och Allir eygha ath haffua, sochnamen eygha tridiumgh ⟨i sac en⟩, Anan kirkia: oc tridia præstir. hur wiþa, som ey kumber landa sak i: ¶ En landa sak kumber ‘huergin i helghis Brut, vtan thi at ains at mader† warder i kyrckio drepin, thar liggia xl. M(arkr) wider, ella i kirkioiogardj, thar liggia xii. M(arkr) wider, thet ier landa sak, thar eyger proastring iij. M(arkr) aff fyrrir Bans maal: ¶ kirkciuri ieru Allar iem helgar a landi, en mader warder wegin i. ¶ En kirkioiogardar ieru triir helgastring i lagh taghnir: Thar skulu saker mend helg haffua iem wel i praestegardj som i kirkioiogardj: thar liggia xii. xl. M(arkr) en saker mader warder wegin i theiri helgh: ¶ En saker allar Andrar ⟨par⟩ som smierj ieru, oc kuma land sak i: tha eyga e kirkioiomen trediumgh‘ yr’ ek k(r)ckia an lut, oc an lut præstir. ¶ Slar thu man y kirkio med stangu ella yxar hambri, eller sargar i kirkioi gardi, thar liggia wider vj. M(arkr) ⟨quipr⟩. ¶ Slar thu man med neffiu i kirkio ella skiuuter thu man, ellar i haar takar, ella med stanghu slaar i kirkioiogardj, ella med yxar hambri thar liggia wider iij. M(arkr), ¶ Slar thu man med neffiu i kirkioiogardj, ella schiauter thu mannj, ella takr thu man i haar. tha liggia wider xij. oyrar helgis Brut. ¶ Than eyger e wigslum syrgia, som wigslir haffuir Britut, och


tar skirt giera, som han oskirt gierdj med iij. M(arkum).

Aff AllA manna frdid.

Nu ier en frider ‘andrir’ tweir, their som mestu warda, at men schulu mannj helg halda, Thar ligger ey Ban wid’er’ oc ey Biscops sak. vtan thi at eyns at thet wadi a helgom daghi gart. ¶ Thet ier alldræ manna frider. lauper a fiwrtan natom éppter paschar, oc fem natom épter midsommar, oc stander a tiu neter oc tiu dagha at huario Bregdi lauper a sola vpgang Badi A och a’ff’. ¶ Dreper thu man à ‘t’heim fridi: tha Bytir thu e so michk wolrdj wider landa alla som hin ier dyr som thu drapt. Banda ha’Y’d er thir engon, fyr than thu Byt haffu. ¶ Sargar thu man ell’a’r Ber a theim fridi, tha Byt iij. M(arkr). ¶ A theim fridi ma engin fore spiella androm hwaski hus ella garda, vtan si saker at iij. ¶ oyra) ‘M(arkum)’

Aff waar fridi

Nu ier en waar frider sidan. han lauper ⟨a⟩ halfum manadi fyri Aldra manna sedir: oc stander a halfuan manadth épter. ¶ à theim fridj ma engin wirda fyri androm

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>175</th>
<th>han</th>
<th>del. Han</th>
<th>173</th>
<th>iij.</th>
<th>in marg. add, trim</th>
<th>177</th>
<th>mannj</th>
<th>leg. man i</th>
<th>183</th>
<th>haffu</th>
<th>leg. haffuir</th>
<th>185</th>
<th>oyra</th>
<th>leg. oyrum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>175</td>
<td>skirt</td>
<td>schir’t’</td>
<td>A; renc oc skere D.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>oskirt</td>
<td>oschir’t’</td>
<td>A; orent oc oskert D.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>gierdj med</td>
<td>haffuer giort oc gjøre thet D.</td>
<td>175</td>
<td>M(arkum)</td>
<td>marc’m’ A.</td>
<td>Aff AllA manna fridhi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
huaski hest ella vxa: med thi at Bondi tarff ‘tha’ Bade, hwarn dag à akrom haffua: 190 
utan han si saker åt iij. M(arkum). Tha en geld ier manna millan: oc lag ryt til 
gels: tha wírdi annan Bo hans, soydi ella kust oc ey ortan soydi, som han tha wider 
tarff.  
†

**Aff Tinghs fridi.**

10. 
Tha ier (emn) sidan tinghs frider manna. Tings men eygha tings frid sykia. Taker 
thu man i har, ella med nefa slar à tingi. tha Byt iij M(arkr) fyrí tings frid, oc than 
laga Byter. Slar thu man med stangu, ella xyar hambri, ellar sar wider mannj, tha 
Byter thu iij. M(arkr). Drejer thu man at dauodom ella aff hag weitrir: tha Byter 
thu vi. M(arkr) vtan thi at eyns at mader warden ath hempdum drerip. Ey ma 
saker mader tings fridi vm troysta: en ey ier aldra manna frider.

**Aff heim fridi.**

11. 
Tha ier sidan hwarjom mannj heim fridir (sífan). Drejer thu at dauodom man 
heimi a garð ‘sinom’, ella aff hag weitrir, tha Byter thu xij M(arkr) wider landa alla, 
oc andrar xij, hanom, oc tan werildi. Slar thu man med stangu ella xyar hambri,


Giffte folkis ret

Fester mand en quinne, och fører henne hiem til sit: oc fordrifuer henne siden bort veden lou: da bëde henne sit godz och xii marck landit: J ligemaade bëde och quinneen mannun om han saa giør

Aff man drapi.

12

Teth ier nu thy nest, en so illa kan aat Biera med fianda radi at mader hitter man at drepa, tha schal flya med hanom fader oc son och Broder: ¶ tha en ey ieru their till tha flyen med hanom nestu nidiar vm .xl. neter til kirckior teirir, som allir men haffua i helgh taktit: ¶ thet ier fardem, ella tingsestedi, ella Atlingabo. thar schal haffua hellgh (oc heli), iem well i praest gardi, som i kirkiogardi: ¶ En sidan thet ier wt gangit: tha ridi tengat, som han bandu wil haffua draghit: oc dragi vm heim torp try: oc 'so' langt a schoga fran heim torpum theim trim, at i midiu mythis fran androm heim torpom, som annan wegh til schogs liggea, en han far loyf, aff
thiem som eygha: ¶ ey maa Bandu dreg a vm ting, ella kaupung, oc ey vm kirckio meira then eyna: tha som han til sykir. ¶ Haffin sidan helg i Bandu sinni: oc so wider han: oc dragi e þeim fridi, som nestir ier eptir pascar, en thar til halder hanom Banda th’ai’m som han ta drogh, than han tha wondredana haffi di ny gart.

thet kalla men Watubandu. ¶ Thaim Banda som dregin stander vm atmelj, hana ma engin lasta: sidan atmelj ier vti, haffui sidan sielffs wald at wara, i bandu sennj: ella fara wtendis til helgra manna ath Byta syrer sinar: haffi atta daga frest til schips at fara, och fari so i sri dagilgrims Ferd sina; och tegar han ater kumber:

tha haffi, ater atta daga frest fara ater til Bandur sinnar i fridi: ¶ Tha en mader gier sakar i kyrkiosochn theiri samu som han siefjir Boor i, tha flye ⟨hamn⟩ yr theiri, oc dreghi so annan sted Bandu: och thau tar som Huaskj boor i moder ella dotir ella styrir. ¶ kyrkio tha syki han than andra medan: fyrj thy at ey maghu their Bagdir til narr at fara: ¶ Tiont tha fyri han halffua, tar som han tider sykir, och halffit liggi qwart at teiri kyrkio som bool war til schurad: ¶ Tha en mader gier sakar i hiem

12v

torpi thy sama som han Boor i, tha flye han tedan: oc drage annan sted Bandu, en han frid wil haffua: med thy at ey maghu their Badir i eyno hiem torpi Boa: 〈 D : Icke maa heller bandu drage om ting: eller til kaffslagen oc icke heller til nogen kirke flere en den han tilsøger: 〉 ¶ Tha en ogutnischer mader drepir ogutnischan〈 mamm: 〉
tha drage so Bandu som gutnischer: en han à boolj siefils sins boor à Gutlandi:

**Aff Biaudi Boot mann.**


239 hiem | leg. haim | 239 drepir | del. drepr | 243 andru | del. andrir | 245 gangur | leg. gangin | 245 thaa | del. taa | 247 lydir | del. fydir
oc han sakan at vi. M(arkum) silffs wider mals eyganda: oc adrar vj. landi: ¶ So liggi oc theim wider som ey halder Bandu sina: thar gangir oc engon By'nr fyrrir, at ey schuli alt vp takas:

**Aff lutuar saker.**


---

**APPENDIX D. A CRITICAL EDITION OF GUTA LAG**

306

ocehan-akatari. M(arkum) silffs wider mals eyganda: oc adrar vj. landi: ¶ So liggi oc theim wider som ey halder Bandu sina: thar gangir oc engon By’nr fyrrir, at ey schuli alt vp takas:

---

**AFF LUTUAR SAKER.**


---

**LANDI | del. landa | luttuar | leg. lutnar | Thaim | leg. Thaun**

---

**VI.**

---

**LANDI | del. landa | luttuar | leg. lutnar | Thaim | leg. Thaun**

---

**LANDI | del. landa | luttuar | leg. lutnar | Thaim | leg. Thaun**

---

**VI.**
tha tarff han hwaski wider wegls ella Bandur: ¶ Tha en ogutniskr mader dreper gutniskan man: tha halder hanom ey Banda, vtan ty at eins en han werildi winnj Budhit: ¶ Tha en oformagi warder mannj at bana, tha ier Byt at xij. M(arkum) sylffs. ¶ Tha en kona hauandi warder wegin med Barni, oc bella men eydom vppi halda: at barn wary henne qwicht i qwidi: tha withi ther hennar husbonde, en han ier til, ier han ey till, tha witmj than som henne ier ner kumpnaster, med trim bolfastom mannom gutniskom aff sami sochn: oc tar til so mangom, at xij sein (\textit{allir}) henne iem Burnir: tha Bytr Barnit at xij M(arkum) sylffs oburit en hana at fullo werildi:

\textbf{Aff werildi manna.}

\textbf{15.}

\textit{Nw ieru en fram sidan werildi manna: ¶ Gutnischs mans werildi Bytis at iij. M(arkum) guls, en han ier at dauodom drepin: ¶ Alla andra manna werildi Bytas at x. M(arkum) sylffs: vtan trels werildi Bytis ath halff fempti M(ark) penninga: ¶ Taker gutnischer mader ogutnischka konw: tha bytis haan at werildi sino: en barn fylgin federnj at werildi: ¶ Taker ogutnischer mader gutnischa kono: tha wari hwat teira at werildi sino, en Barn fylgin federni (\textit{at verel}d).}

\textbf{Aff Bandu werelidi.}

\textbf{16.}

\begin{itemize}
\item \textit{wegls} \textit{leg. wegsl} \textit{withi} \textit{leg. witn} \textit{sami} \textit{leg. samu} \textit{hwat} \textit{leg. hwart}
\item \textit{hwaski wider wegls ella Bandur} \textit{huerrcken vid veggel som der høre till at han er vegin oc dræbin oc icke heller bande at begære om den fridt som der høre till D. \textit{hwaski} \textit{huakti A.}
\item \textit{wider wegls} \textit{czu vliende G.} \textit{wider} \textit{\div A.} \textit{wegls} \textit{vegsl A.} \textit{ella} \textit{epha A.}
\item \textit{ogutniskr} \textit{ogutnischit sic A.} \textit{haldr} \textit{haldr A.} \textit{hanom ey} \textit{hanum A.}
\item \textit{Banda} \textit{ey frihet D.} \textit{en} \textit{et A.} \textit{oformagi} \textit{som er verløts som faderls D.}
\item \textit{warder} \textit{verfr A.} \textit{ierr} \textit{ir A.} \textit{xij} \textit{tolf A.} \textit{silffs} \textit{silfs A.}
\item \textit{hauandi} \textit{hafandi A.; swarvúrg G;} \textit{siuglig D.} \textit{wederd} \textit{verfr A.} \textit{bella} \textit{orca A;} \textit{vormag G;} \textit{begere D.}
\item \textit{at} \textit{en sic A.} \textit{withi} \textit{vijj A.} \textit{husbonde} \textit{husbunde G;} \textit{hosbonde D.} \textit{ierr} \textit{ir A.}
\item \textit{ierr han} \textit{han} \textit{ey} \textit{\div A;} \textit{nicht G;} \textit{icke D.} \textit{kurmpnaster} \textit{nehest bystet G;} \textit{høre nemst till D.}
\item \textit{kumpnaster} \textit{cumnast A.} \textit{bolfastom mannom gutnikom} \textit{besessenen gutnischen manner selbir habinde G.}
\item \textit{samv A.} \textit{mangom} \textit{margum A.}
\item \textit{at} \textit{en xij} \textit{tolf A.} \textit{\langle allir \rangle} \textit{alle G.}
\item \textit{iem Burnir} \textit{glichen syn G;} \textit{iemnlige oc borne D.}
\item \textit{Bytr} \textit{bytis A.; sal man bussin G;} \textit{boder mand for D.}
\item \textit{all} \textit{A.}
\end{itemize}

**Aff osoydom**

17.

Uxi faster oc fim wintra gamal: Bier oc mannj xij ‘Mar’ca sak i gard: en han wader mannj at bana: ¶ Hest schal man Binda en til Bonda komber a fiarda staurgulffi fran lid stucki: oc fiughur stigh, fran durom mans: tha wardar ey vtan frembra foti manne rar oc tannom en han bits: ¶ Tha en thi gard far, ella til kletis: ta Bint wider galff ella bak weg, tha wardar thu ey frammar than a tan war telt: ¶ Galter merchter ier at tredia, en han haffuir tria winter faster gangit. ¶ Hunder ier at fiarda hanom wardar e vm alt, en han schada gier, eygi tan som wil, ¶ Theim fiaurom oquedins witom wardar hwar mader i gardi sinom wider xij. M(arka) S(ilfs) sak. ¶ Tha en oquedins witer wader sweuerdari mannj at Bana tan gutniskom: tha falla e tweir lutir aff werelde hans, en trediung tha Byti hin som soydin eygir, thet kalla men kraftuar wereldi, ¶ En oquedins witer wader manni at bana ella lestir man at limom, thet schal kreffuia oc ey hempna lagrydia til som till andra geldeta: ¶ tha en oquedins witer weit mannj sar ella lasti: ta fallin e tweir lutir aff Bot: en tridiung Byter than som soydin eygir: ¶ fyri hund Bit, ta Bytir tanna spur hwat
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at tweim oyrom til fiugura: | ¶ Naut, oc Rus oc swin tha wardar mader ey meira fyrir, than that siefllt ier wert, en that ier mannj at schada: ¶ Tha en osoyder ier oc warder mader warader at fyri kyrckio durom oc fyri sochna mannom, oc gier sidan med ogømslu: tha Byti halffu meira than sakir wird, ¶ tha en minnj laster wara than soydir ier werder, tha Byti halffu minna: ¶ Hunder ier at fiarda, hanom wardar è vm alt til halffs werildis, en han schada gier, eygi than som wil: ¶ Hwnns bit, tha Byti tanna spur hwart, at tweim oyrom til fiugura: ¶ Tha en han sar gier ella lima lyti: tha Bytir at halffuom mestu Botom: thet schal krefftua oc ey hempna lagrydia til, som andra gelda:

18r

Ber mader kuno.

315

Ber mader kuno, so at barn spillis oburith: oc haffu than qwicht i qwidi warith: tha Bytir han halfft werildi: ¶ tha en haan kennir thet mannj, en han dular: ta Bindi han han wider med witnom tweim, theim som haan sich schutadi fyrrat a tridia] à tridia dygri, at haan berd wary: ella theim som wider waru oc boolfastom: oc tweim qwinja witnom, at Barn wari sidan dath Burith, sidan han Berd war: oc witi thet siefllf med vj. tiauda eydi, at that qwicht war:

320

⟨ D: Aff barns foruaring ⟩

¶ Kuna skal Barns at getha at mungati hwario: leggi i kietta, och haffi ner siir: ella haffui barn i kniom, ella leggi i sengh: oc leggi sialff ner: so schal hwarion kuna ⟨ vm ⟩ tria winter barns gezlru weita: ¶ Ta en naqwar mader warder mid wada i teiri gezlu barni at bana, tha Byti han werildi fullo: ¶ Tha en kuna leggir barn à

325

318 sakir | leg. sak ier | 322 than | leg. than | 330 qwicht | del. qwic[0]t | 330 war | del. wa[0]
golff nider, ella seti wardalaust: ella i seng tha ier barnit obyt, hwat som helst kan at koma: ¶ tha en kuna ganger tar mid Barn i seng, som druchnir men liggia fyrir, oc kumpnar barn i trangi ella med kledom: tha ier than Barn o Byt: than et haan liggi sielf fer:

**Aff sara farom.**


¶ Warder mader Berder med luca haggom, so et synir slegir ieru: ta Byter halff M(ark) hwaru slegh, ti fuijgura: oc than med samu witnom som til sara: ¶ Ier
Tha en lima … ord som wers ÷ D.
Tha en lima lastir fylgia da Bytir ij. M(ar)k Sylffs. ¶ Slegir so mangir som synlikir warda Bytis hvar at haff M(ar)k pen(ninga). ¶ Haffuir mader syna slegi a hand: oc seger hana onyta wara ta witi med samu witnom, som til Sara: ¶ Tha en ey ier

---
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med nefa Byt ij. oyra: ¶ Ganger tu wider eynom tha haffuir han witord til fiaugura slega: ¶ Ganger thu ey wider, tha haffuer tu witord som wers: ¶ Slar thu man med stangu Byt halff M(ark) hwart hagg til tyg gia marka frammar Bytuer ey mader fe sino fyri luka hag, vtan lastir fylgin: thet ier lagh Guta:

Aff loyski
Loyski thet som finger ma a setia, bytuer at viiij. ertaugom. tha en thu ma à setia, ta Bytis halff M(ark). ¶ Tha en tumbling later til at tridia ta ier Byt at M(ark) pen(ninga). ¶ tha en loyski ier so mikit at lofa ma a leggia tha þiru ìru iþí`. M(arkr) pen(ninga). ¶ (þa en huert bar ír af þa bytir at marc silfs.` En frammar bytir ai þau et huert fram sei af dregit)

⟨A: Hitta ier þet sum nylast war takit vm loyski ›
¶ Ier loyski meira than lofi hyl: thet Bytis at (Mark) (Silfs). Ier hwart har aff tha Bytis at ij. M(arkum) (Silfs): ¬Ier ier tofha mannj haggin, ier Byt at (Mark) (Silfs)¬
¶ Skegh mans Bytis so som annor haardragh:

Scheinir tu kledi mans.

20.

21.
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Aff ypno sari oc luka haggom

Sari schal mader warda ypno til iemlanga oc eyna nat. ¶ Warder mader Berdir med luka haggom oc ligger i seng samu so at han ey ganger vppti millan, oc far than forschiel: tha haffui fiugra Bolfasta manna witni oc triggia Domera aff sama Siettungi, oc tar til so manga at xij. sein: ¶ Tha en han ey far forschiel: ta hafi hans arui witord med samu witnom: ¶ En ganger han vppti millan, tha haffui han witord som wers:

Gier mader manni wegtuerra

Gier mader mannj wegtuerra, takar <rihandi> man i beisl: ella gangandi <mann> i acslar oc wender vm aff gatu sennj ta Byter tu ‘tuncka’ viij. ertauger: ¶ En gier han mannj wald oc later lenger fylgia, tha Byti iij. (Markr) hanom fyri wald, oc iij.

23.

22.

23v.
(Marka) moga:

**Bers trell.**


**Aff Allom Lutom**

En oformagar ieru vngir epter fadur daudan: oc ieru sinnir magandu men, tha ma ey hin elsti schillas wider hin yngsta: tan at noytas taki fyr than hin ier magandu, noytin allir aff allo oschipto, tar til at hin ier femptan Ára gamal, sidan taki hin wider schiauti oc scalom, oc leitar fyri sier hwar en their ey willia lenger saman wara: Tha en so takar noytas, at iord ward epter til fydur selia fyr allir sein magandu, ta al festu Aldra iemt, oc ey at fastu selia, so elsta, so yngsta: vtan ti at eyns, at naqwar taki

---

438 huer] del. hu[0]r 443 Tunca] del. dunca 449 sinnir] leg. synir

Thar som gangs i Gardi.

Thar som gang i gardi, ta liauti dotir epidur sin mydernj oc fadur mydernj, ¶ tha en fadur systrer ieru til, ta giapt ella ogipter: ta takin taar set fadur mydernj.
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tha en nakvar ieru ogiptar tha takin a(t)unda penning aff federnj sino, tegar geld ieru guldin. ‘][ thar som gangs i gardj tha liautin nidiar hafud lut mid Burnum a fiarda man, en fiarrar ir ⟨ba⟩ takin attunda lut sidan gielr ieru guldin oc qвинна lutir ieru ut rettadir: ][ En qвинна takin sliðt yr gardj sum thar ir haffdu en thett scrifat ‘ war a fyrsta Arj: ir thet ai scrifat ⟨ba⟩ hafi garthîn wittord:’’ ’][ Gongs eptir man oc lîmpnar enki a gardj: ta haffui at vpheldi i gardj till atmels, laup rugar, oc annan korn vm hwaru manad: en han ey doyr ella giptis a fran: ][ En than kuster som henne fylgði tar i gardj: ta taki slikan yr gardj, som haan i qwam: ][ Warder kuna gipt i fleirin garða, oc far barn i fleiroim: ta liauti so barn som Barn myðernj sitt badj eygu oc oya: oc Bryder takin vp fyri samsystrih ⟨sinar⟩, hwat ta ieru helder giptar ella ogiptar: ][ Tha en kuna ier gipt aff gardi med heimfylgli, oc gangs eptir hana: ta liauts ater i gard sama som haan aff giptis: ][ Tha en gangit ier i theim garða, ta liauti nesta blod, huat som helder ier kerldi,ella qwindi ‘och thoyghin qwindi lengra than a fiarda man. Iru badi iam ner tha liauti than kerldi.’

---

67 nakvar | del. naqar  167 a(unda) | del. attunda  468–472  thar som gangs ... hafi garthîn wittord | in marg. add. Nota defectum  173 garthîn | del.[0]arthîn  473 hwaru | leg. hwarm  473 han | leg. haan  476 eygu | leg. eygn

Hogsl. oc id.


Aff Qwinna Lutom.

En vm qwinna lutu: tha liauter dotir oc dotur Barn: tha en ey ier teira til: (ба liautr systir eþa systur barn. ba en eki ier ʰaɪɾa til) ta liauter fadurs systir oc fadurs systur barn. ¶ Tha en ecke ier teira til, ta liauti nesta blod, à fiarda man oc ey frammar: ¶ Ier ey thet til, ta standj quârt i gardi, med nidium. ¶ Ier kerldi gangit sik, oc ier i qwinna lutu kumit, huat som helder ier aff Brydir ella systir. oc ieru badin blods iam ner tha liautin Badin: ¶ Brinniinn tweir fedgar Badir i eyno huse, ella drunchna badir a eyno schiipi: ella falla badir i eyno wegi: ta ier systir iam ner som doter. ¶ Warda synir fleyrin eptir man oc aukas aff allom: kan gangs epter nakra: ta warin allir iam ner at lutom til fiarda: ¶ Hwar som sell set federni, oc affhendis allo ty som innan sturs ier, wari schilder wider lutu med nidium, ella Brydrom:

382 liutir | leg. liautir 382 synir | del. synr 385 liffuando | leg. liffuandom 385 thaim | leg. thau 390 wegi | leg. wigi 399 sturs | del. stams

oc wari i ogutnska manna wereldi: en synir hans warin i lutom oc i lagom med nidiom, en teir fa ater triggia marcka leigi:

**Aff Thy Barn**


---

**References:**

Page 321

250 | oc wari i ogutnska manna wereldi: en synir hans warin i lutom oc i lagom med nidiom, en teir fa ater triggia marcka leigi:

251...
med iiii M(arkum) pen(nninga) hwat helder han ier gutnischer ella ogutnisker. ¶ En warder mader innj takin med thysyi tydotur: tha loysy vndan hand ella fot med iij. M(arkum) Silfs. ¶ Far gutnisch kuna tydotur wider ogutnischan man, tha haffua sama rett, som fyrra war segder.

**Aff intecht.**
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med henne, ta geffui henne hogsl. vijj M(ar)k oc fydi sielffuir barn sith: ¶ En
kennir kuna hanom barn: oc han seger ney wider: ta weri sich med sama witnom
som gutnischer: ¶ En barn fydin tery som hogsl eyga vp taka: fader ella Broder en
han ogipter ier: ¶ Far ogutnischer mader barn, wider ogutnisha kuno, ta geffui oc
henne hogsl. iij. M(ar)k oc fydi fader barn sett: ¶ Tha en han wader innj takin
< miþ >, tha geffui oc iij. M(ar)k tan et ey si barn(c).

Aff hori.

Gier mader hoor ta Byti iij. M(ar)k tingi, oc vj. M(ar)k mals eyganda: ¶ Tha en
mader gier yffuir hoor: lerder ella olerder: tha Byti xij. M(ar)k landi oc Adrar xij.
M(ar)k mals eyganda. ¶ Gier gipter mader hoor, wider ogipta kono, tha schal han
hana hogsla: ¶ Gier lag gipt kuna hor wider ogiptan man, tha schal han hana ey
hogsla: ¶ Warder mader innjakin med annars mans kuno, lerder ella olerder, ta
liggi hanom wider xl. M(ar)k ella liff hans: < oc raþi baun mals aigandi huat bann
heldr vill. fe eþa lif hans > ¶ Lukkar mader dotur mans: ella naquari hans warnt til
festur, vtan fadurs Rad ella frenda, ta Byti .xl. M(ar)k mals eyganda: that haffui
land xij. (Markr) aff. ¶ Taker mader kuno ella moy med Rani, ella waldi, vtan
fadurs rad ella frenda, tha Radin teir, som hennar mal Rychta halsi, ella werildi
hans, en kuna ier gutnisch: that haffui land xij. M(ar)k aff. ¶ Tha en kuna ier
gutnisch, ta Radin teir som hennar mal Rychta halsi, hans ella x. M(ar)k silffis,
that haffui land xij. M(ar)k aff.

30.

30r

Gier | del. 539
Gier | del. Warder mader 552 naquari | leg. naquan

Gier | del. Warder mader 552 naquari | leg. naquan

obir spil ‘Aff Horj: 26’ G; Om hoor sag D. 546 Gier | Gierir A. 546 mader ] mandr A. 546
iij. M(ar)k ] + penninge D. 546 M(ar)k ] marcar A. 547 gier | gierir A. 547 yffuir hoor ]
czwevald obirspl. Also das sy beide echte lûte synt G. 547 lerder ella ] ÷ A. 547 xij. ] tolfs
A. 548 Gier | Gierir A. 548 giper ] giptir A. 549 hogsla ] + das ist vorbesserunge tûn noch rechte
G. 549 Gier | Gierir A. 551 xij. ] fiauratigi A. 551 ella ] eþa A. 551 oc raþi baun ... eþa
lif hans ] vnde is sta czu deme wedsrsachen welches her habin wil lip adir gelt G; ÷ D. 552 mader ]
A.
Warder kuna schemd a wegom.


Aff Qwinna Gripom. 32.

Warder kuna schemd a wegom. } in marg. add. Wald:lib. 2. Tit.16. 363 fulla } del. fu[00]a
564 haan } del. han 566 taim } leg. taun


q Sliter thu snodir kunur tha Byt halff M(ark) hwaria til mesta Bota: oc fa henne alt ater: witi sielfh haan ner alt ier: q Schiauter thu kuno so at henne stinka kled ek laghi thi, som thaim fyrra waru. ta Byt viij. ertauger. q Stinka taim à leg midian Byt halff M(ark).


tha ier thet griper hin oheidwerdi, oc heitir folak griper. tar liggia engar fe Byter til:

En vm qwinna gripi ieru lagh taim: da er der saadan lou til D. q qwinna gripi | + at en tager paa en quinne D. | ieru lagh taim | Das is eyn rech van gryten der wibe G. q ieru | ieru A. | taim | baun A. | tupp eila hwiff | ere houbit tuch G; huffue eller dug D. q so at ey ier med wada gart | mit willen G. q at | et A. q ta en | [a 'en' A. q pen(ninga)] | ÷ A; p(e(n)n)inge G.p(e(n)n)inge D. q witord | witorð sic A. q ellar | eða A. q viij. ertauger | eyne halbe Mær G; + det er iiij huiide D. q viij. | atta A. q ertauger | ertau | f'gar A. q Sliter tu Bade byt halff M(arkr) | ÷ G. q Sliter | slitar A. q Bade | þeis A. q tha en | oc slider tu saa at D. q haan | 'han' A. q omkull D. q iiij huiide G. q iiij. | + A; iij G. q M(arkr) | + pfennyrge G. q Sliter thu snodir ... ner alt ier | ÷ G. q snodir | snorir | 'pung' D. q hvaria | hueria A. q mestu | mestu A. q haan | ÷ A; ÷ D. q ier | ir A. q stinka | stinqua A. q laghi thi, som thaim fyrra waru | erem wesen G. q thi | som | annerledis en D. q thi | by A. q thaim | þau A. q fyrra | fyr A. q viij. ertauger | iiij huiide D. q viij. | atta A. q ertauger | ertaugar A. q ertaugar A. q Stinka | Stinqua A. q taim | þau A. q þau A. q òl leg midian | af laue mit paa D. q Stinka | Stinqua A. q taim | þau A. q Stinka | Stinqua A. q thaim | þau A. q þau A. q haucht | hau G. q sia ma Bade | þeis ma sia A. q loyndir | i'oyndir A. q M(arkr) | + pfenninge G; + penninger D. q bauglid | hant leyt G; ryggin D. q halft | haum sic A; sy G; hon D. q albuga | albuga A. q viij. ertauger | iiij huiide D. q viij. | atta A. q ertauger | ertaugar A. q ertaugar A. q axtlarhawd | axtlar hafus A; ere schulderen G; axler eller hoffuid D. q ertauger | iiij huid D. q ør | fem A. q ertauger | er A. q ertauger | er A. q oyri | en sæsling D. q Taker thu vm ankal Byt halff M(arkr) | ÷ G. q Taker | Tacr A. q ertauger | ankul A. q millan knis oc kalua | ere waden G. q millan | milli A. q kalua | leggin D. q Byt viij. ertauger | iiij huiide bsd da D. q viij. | atta A. q ertauger | ertaugar A. q ertaugar A. q ertaugar A. q er A. q en handar meir | en hand bæder fram mer D. q ier | ir A. q griper hin oheidwerdi | eyn vnerlich gri G; it griip som er vchristeltig D. q folak griper | eynes toren gri G; folak Griper D.
flestar vnnar sidan tar (til) komber. ¶ Tha en fyri warder ogutnisch kuna: ta Byt tu henne halffu minna gripi alla, than gutniski kuno. ⟨en firi ir cuna frels oc friþ wet⟩

**Aff wagnikla ferdir.**


**Aff Erfis gierdom.**
Erffuis gierdir ieru allar aff tachnar. vtan hwar som wil, tha geffui kledi oc schydi innan sochna folkke, epeter than som fram ier lidin.

615

**Aff Qwinna ret.**

Um qwinna ret ier that sempt sik, at nauta bo schulu taka til fempta Bands, Rus oc lamb so som thaar thiet i gard flytto. ¶ Gylting ier aff takin, vtan tassala: ¶ Gyltan kuper schal brenn, hur som han hittis. ¶ Gulad oc silckis band annor tan slungin ieru oc aff takin. ¶ Gylt (kar oc) belti gamul ieru oc schydi innan sochna folcke, ept er than som fram ier lidin.

620

Aff Qwinna ret

Um qwinna ret ier that sempt sik, at nauta bo schulu taka til fempta Bands, Rus oc lamb so som thaar thiet i gard flytto. ¶ Gylting ier aff takin, vtan tassala: ¶ Gyltan kuper schal brenna, hur som han hittis. ¶ Gyllad oc silckis band annor tan slungin ieru oc aff takin. ¶ Gyllt kar oc belti gamul ieru oc schydi innan sochna folcke, ept er than som fram ier lidin.

625

**D: Aff skarlagen oc blaadrect**

¶ Scharlad oc Bladragning sliti hwar som that ier, oc engin meira till auki sidan that ier slitit, hwaski fornt ella nyt.

**D: Om ridklede oc høginde**

Reidkledi oc Reid wengi schierins ey smera, than i fiardunga:
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**Aff Gutnischi kuno.**

624 Scharlad] del. Scharla[0]

625 Scharlad] del. Scharla[0]

626 Scharlad] del. Scharla[0]
Thitta ier oc semp sik vm gunnischar kunor: at hwar Broder gieri Rad fyri syster sennj til giptur: ¶ wil hand ey ta geffui (henn) attunda lut aff eigu sennj til vpheldis med ‘schynian’ sina nesta frenda oc sochna manna, so at haan hwargin oradlika fyri gieri sinom kust:

¶ En om oguthnisch folck:  
< En vm ogutnist fulk > ta liautin twar systrir gin eynom Bryder. ¶ tha en falla kan, syschona millan ella syschona Barna: ta schiptin so thi som federnj ella myndern. ¶ Tha en f ierrar genger ta liauti, than som blodi ier nest:

Aff farwegom.  37.
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lad farwegh mans ta gieri than lid som gardin eygir. och han wardi lidiom som wegh eygir:

**Aff schoga bregdan.**

650 Bregdas tweir men vm skogh, ta schal mader haffua tu witnj lichs witnj, oc ortar witnj: Ladigs wid garran, ella troder kluffuit oc a stumbla leght, ella klappat qwisti oc saman buri, oc latit torkas til haff fallar: thet ier ortar witni full. ¶ Witord haffi tan som lichs witnj haffer driaugari at ort vm kring, an aff teim som mest A, schal fyrsta til eyds at ganga: wil han ey med eydi witna: ta dugi hans witni hwargom:
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Aff halff géirdi.

Beydis mader halff géirdi aff mannj: ta schal ti segia mannj med granna witnom ella kirkiu manna: ¶ oc schilin sochna men til lutar i samu siau natom. ¶ Líauti than sanid sielffuir med granna witnom en hin wil ey wider wara, [¶ oc gierd tar som thu liauter: [¶ en hin haffui ⟨ sipan ⟩ at melis frest, fran luta Dagi: ¶ Tha en sidom koma soyder i ta tak i hus, oc lat ey wt fyr tan han spîl Byter, oc halff M(ark) fram seter til gards, Hauffi gierd in halffumar manadi oc taki ater wið sin: ¶ Tha en ⟨ hann ⟩ ey gierder i halffum manadi, ta tappi sinnj halff M(ark) oc tu tak

330
Hwar som hagger oloyfis.

Hagger mader innan gierda oloyfis, oc aker til: ta wari saker at ijj, M(arkum) wider mals eyganda: oc adrom trim wider moga. ¶ En bier han yr heim til sina, ta warj

\[ G: van holcze \]

Taker tu wid mands, ella gards wirki, ella timber i schogi, Byt vj. oyra: \[ Tha en hin haffuir til gatur fyrt, ta ier iij. M(ar) en han ecki leifir sith ater, oc fai hannom alt set eygit ater iem got oc iem mikit en tu warder sendar ath, wit sielffer med eidi ner alt ier:

Aff Saudi:


Aff eygna kaupi.

\[ 41.

\[ 42.

\[ 43v\]
ella qwislar men: wilia ey teir: ta ieru qvindis men nerarj than vtan men. ¶ En Sel mader eygu sina, oc kaupir andra med sama werd till machs sir, tar ganger ey affrad aff: ¶ Jord ier oc aldri affrad laus, vtan thiti at eins, et allir lydir selin, ella haan wardi at werldi guldin ella markleygi at hiemfygli a mala tingi vt luffad ella at tia’u’ffgeldi guldin. ¶ Jeru Brydir fleirin ella Bryllingiar, oc haffua schipt, ella adrir syldier men: oc selia ymsir eygu sina: tha taki engin teira affrad aff Adrom, vtan tan som teim ier nestir, oc halder sennj eigu:

Siter mader i hers handom. 43.
Siter mader i hers handom, oc gelder fyri sik iord ella eigu sina, ta ier nidi nester ater loyssa, en han wil oc fe fyri gelda sidan hin heim kumber. ¶ Siter bonda son i hers handom ella oformagi: ta ma engin han dyrare ater loyssa, than at iij. M(arkum) S(ils) vtan thi at eyns at vmbud si til fadur ella frenda: oc haffui tridiung at awagst, slict sama fe som han galt: en witord far han ey frammar tan til triggia M(arka) S(ils) en ta taker at schilia ¶ En hin som lutua haffer eigu, oc ey ier oformage, han gier sielffer mala firir sir, so som han wider ma koma, thet stander som han sielffur gier. ¶ Thaim ieru lagh landa mellan, et wt lenningar loysi aldrj dyrari man gutnischan, tan at iij M(arkum) S(ils) vtan ⟨ ham ⟩ haffi vmbud fadurs ella


Aff Gutnisch mans syni.

Engin gutnischs mans son far schipt aff feder sinom aff eyger, than at han Beydas, vtan thy at eins et fader wili: ella giptis med fadurs Rad oc wilia. ¶ Tha en han schipta wili: ta taki vp haffud lut sen aff oyrum at rechning, en fader ta haffui bol set oschipt, oc gëffui teim lands leigur aff, oc haffut lut sen, oc radi siefhfer fyr sir fara huart han wil, ' nota defectum, ¶ tha en thair hafa bol fährin tha dari sun a nequat thaira, och at rechning om hand will, so frammarla som fadir schynias ai orada mader. ¶ tha en og(ut)niser mand haffer synj ogypta, eþa gipta, 'Tha fain aldrij schipt aff feder sinum vtan fadir schynj orada mader.' so frammarla som fader
Schijnas ey orada mader.

**Aff Geldom.**

Hwar som gield gier oradlika, tha fyri gieri sinom lut, oc ey meira: ¶ En engin geldj geld epet han daudan frammar en hans kuster winder at.

**Aff wediom.**

Haffuir mader wed takit aff mannj fyri sand geld deti tha stefni hanom til kirckior, ella til tings, oc loysi ater at laga frestom ella wirdin sochna men *(epa þings menn)*.

**Aff tingom.**

Titta ier oc sempt sick, at ting all schal Byria halda fyri midian dag. Radmen schulu retta a hunderis tingom. ¶ Hwar som ey komk eptir han daudan frammar en hans kuster reger at. Hwar som ey komk eptir han daudan frammar en hans kuster reker tiil oc vindur D.

**Aff fear kraffui.**

Kan fear kraff warda manna millan ta far engin hoygri lag aff androm tan till vi.
manna, en theim kan a schilia. En vm eygna deylu til xvij, manna en delia ier til M(arkar) gulds: so oc than et meira si. ¶ Tha en teim schil å tha schulu thet wirda hunderis Radmen vtan eyd, en delia si til M(arkar) gulds oc takin fyrstu stempno

vm manada frest aff teiri. ¶ Tha en han wil ater segia: ta segia ater fyrri halffuan manad fram til tridiu. ¶ Tha en deyla ier minna tan til M(arkar) gulds: ta schal taka

vj manna stempno fyrstu vm halffuan manad: Tha en han wil ater segia, ta seghi ater fyrri vj, nata frest oc flytì vm vij. nata frest adra fram til tridiu: en stempnu ma ey lenger flytia vtan beggia willia:

800 **Aff manna Kaupi.**

Kauper tu mans man i gard thin ta Royn han vm vj. daga, en a siauanda geld thu werd ella ater leyd en thir ey at gies. ¶ Tha en hin wil ey ater taka som seldi, vtan wil tik wider haldà med formala, en tu haffua schuldir oc ater leyda: hwat som thir at gatis wer ella Beter. ¶ Tha en thu haffuir schiel schielom gin: thet at tu schuler ater leyda at frestm, en thir ey at gatis: ta haffuer thu witord som ater leyder, oc lagum fylgir. ¶ Tha en tu haffuir man lenger: oc wiltu sidan ater leyda, sidan frest ier wt lidin, oc kallas tu haffua tan for mala gart, tha haffuir hin witord som at laghom seldi, gelt tha werd hinom, oc haff thet tu ficht: ¶ En sidan schal sali warda fyri trim lastum, Brutfalli, oc Bedroytu, wardar om ny oc nidan, tha en fran beyni werkir, ta wardar till atmels oc sidan fyri brigsl allan alder. ¶ Ta en han warder brigder i heldi, ta huti thu sala thin oc leyd hanom a hand, gieri han ta man

---

800 gulds | del. gulss | 792 segia | leg. segi | 801 Royn | del. [0]oyyn | 802 ater | del. attir | 804 Beter | del. [0]eter | 804 lagum | del. lagunj | 809 warda | del. werda | 809 nidan | leg. nidar | 809

---

thir heimulan, ella fai athir tir werd so mikit som thu hanom fyrir gafft. ¶ Tha en ider schil vm, hin kallas mid mala haffua selt: en tu kalas med fastu kaupi haffua kaupt. ta haffuer oc tan witord som med fastu kaupir, oc laghum fylger.

**Aff yxna kaupi.**

Kaupir tu vxa, tha Royn han vm tria daga: lastir fylgia hanom tweyr, an en han ey drager, annar en han briauter.

**Kaupir thu ko,**

*< caupir þu ko þa >* Royn hana om mialk mal try: lastir fylgia hennj tweir, an en haan sparkas so at ey ma molka, annar en haan m(i)elk stulin ier *< D: det tredie ad hon bryder >.*

**Aff hesta kaupi.**

Kaupir tu hest, ta Royn han vm iij. daga, oc leid med lasti ater, en tu naqwan finder. Lastir fylgia hanom triir, tan ier en an starblinder ier, annar en han bits. tridi en han frembro fotom sparcas. Tha en tu han lenger haffuer, ta taker ey sali wider, tan at lastir fylgin vtan han sielffuer willi.

**Rider tu annan mans hest.**

Taker tu hest mans i beitu, ella annan sted olofis hinom som eyger, oc rider ella aker med. ta Byt iij. M(ar)k(r) mals eyganda, oc adrar iij. moga, en tu warder sander at

---
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Aff yxna kaupi. 50.

Kaupir tu vxa, tha Royn han vm tria daga: lastir fylgia hanom tweyr, an en han ey drager, annar en han briauter.

**Kaupir thu ko,**

*< caupir þu ko þa >* Royn hana om mialk mal try: lastir fylgia hennj tweir, an en haan sparkas so at ey ma molka, annar en haan m(i)elk stulin ier *< D: det tredie ad hon bryder >.*

**Aff hesta kaupi.**

Kaupir tu hest, ta Royn han vm iij. daga, oc leid med lasti ater, en tu naqwan finder. Lastir fylgia hanom triir, tan ier en an starblinder ier, annar en han bits. tridi en han frembro fotom sparcas. Tha en tu han lenger haffuer, ta taker ey sali wider, tan at lastir fylgin vtan han sielffuer willi.

**Rider tu annan mans hest.**

Taker tu hest mans i beitu, ella annan sted olofis hinom som eyger, oc rider ella aker med. ta Byt iij. M(ar)k(r) mals eyganda, oc adrar iij. moga, en tu warder sander at

---

Aff schipa gezlu. 53.

Aff Ransakan. 54.
Kuma men mannj til gards oc beydas at ransaki, tha ma engin androm Ransakan synia: wil han granna sina wider haffua, tha schal Bida teyra: en ey wil man oschiel...
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¶ Tha

<ba> en mader bier mannj fula i gard oc i hus, thet som laas ier a, oc wil soman fyrrad: ta haffu fyrí burit allo thi som han Bar. ¶ En sidan ta Bytí han werlidi hanom so miklu som hin ier dyr, som <hamn> a hand bars, oc ii. M(arkr) tingi tar til, en gutnisch mader wardir fyrír, ta Bytír han xíj. M(arkr) landi.

Aff Tiaufa Rethi:

55.

En vm tiaufa ret, tha ieru lagh taim. ¶ Hwar som stiel ij. oyrá ella tweim oyrom minna, ta Bytí vj. oyrá snattan Bot: ¶ Stiel han millan tyggya oyra oc mark silfís, thal schal han ting fyra oc merkia, oc til werlidi dyma. ¶ stiel han sidan en han

45v

46r
merchtier ier, than et minni si tha schal han hengia: ⟨ G Stiel hann til marc sils ëpa maira þa scal hann oc þau hengia ⟩ ⟨ D: Och om gullantzk mandt saa fore komer, da skal han fœris til ting oc til gods dœmis ⟩

870 Stiel trell mans

oyri ella oyri minna, tha Byti hwar drotin fyri han iij. oyra. En hin kumber sielffer vp typti som typtit eiger. ¶ Ta en typti ier meira than oyri, ta haffui e han fyrst set ater, oc trigildi sidan so mikit som tar til biers som typti war: ¶ stiela fleirin trelar an oyri, ta Byti hwar drotin trigildi fyri sin trell en han ey kumber sielfffuir typti vp. ¶ Tha en tiauffnader ier ey alder til, ta schal wita tan som tiauffnadin misti huru mikil han war: oc than thi at eyns et hus ella laas wari til brutit ¶ Tha en ey ier vndir lari takit, oc huaski ier til Brutit hun ella hell, ta taki han trelin oc fresti han, oc leggi engin wider lagh fram, kumj Byti heilom oc Brustheilom ater drotin til handa, oc Byti als enchi fe fyrir: than en han enga saghu aff haffui. ¶ Ta en agrippir ier engin til ‘vtan’ vesl ‘,’ eyn, ta schal leggia fram wider lagh ofresta mans.


872 than | leg. uthan 872 wy | del. [00] 878 Bain | del. Bein 872 Byti | del. Bytir 880 wesl | leg. wenel 883 nauger | leg. naud 888 han | del. haa 890 funder | leg. funder
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¶ Stelet ymant van buiten eczliche dingh G.
han a fluta komber, oc fyri halff M(ark) en yr lands syn komber: ¶ than schal man ater loysa, som schipit atti, vtan thi at eyns, at lagrekat wary: ¶ Tha en han haffuir handom kumit a gripi naqwara, ta schal gripi ater loysa som trelin atti. ¶ Tha en schip war lagreckit ella vndir lasi takit, th loysi than schipit ater som trelin atti, oc so gripi alla som han handom a quam oc toygi frammar tan til iij. M(arka). ¶ Tha en han bort lauer a schipi wardalaus, ella a haffi nider sinker, so et hin mister trel sen som atti: ta geldi tan trel, som schipit atti: ¶ Warder naqwar mader bundin agrips laus: tha schulu thet schuda trir Radmen, oc hoyra thans ord, hwat han ier schylder ella oschylder: ¶ teir iij. Radmen schulu wara aff hunderi sama: ella sama settungi: teir schulu witna thet som teir hoyra han ier schulder ella oschylder, so oc en agriper ier:

Aff Oquedins ord.

Oquedins ord iu mannj fiugur: tiauffer, oc mordingi Rauferi, oc casnawarger:: ¶ En ⟨ vny ⟩ kuno ta ieru fem: tiauffer oc mordingi, hordomber oc fordenscheper oc casnawarger: ⟨ D : disse hille de forskenndz ordt som de saa en kallede ⟩ ¶ Tha en mader worder fyrir slikom oquedins ordrom, ta schal fara han til gards hinom som thert haffuir melt, oc stempna han til kyrckior med schielom, oc bidia ord sin ater taka, taim som osinom ieru melt i stridi, ella i vff drycki. ¶ Tha en han dyll, ta sueri med trim mannyn fyri sochna mannyn at han taim ord aldri merti: ¶ Winder han ey eydty vppi halidit: ta Byti han tria oyra oc symi man med trim manna eydi at kyrckio. ¶ Bregdar mader mannj ⟨ slic ⟩ oquedins ord fyri sochn alli, ella a tingi,
ella a stempno, oc far ey sannad gart, tha Byti (hann) hanom iij. M(arkr) oc symi
han med vj. manna eydi a tingi: therta schal sykia at laga frestom so kuno som
männj.

920 Om gullad
Dette er oc y lou tagit, at gulladt oc mantiil baandt, och blaadragning, maa ingin paa
landit køffue, eller lade gjord, vden han bøde iij mark tingsmenne

925 Om pennigs øl
Tiil tings der som lantz sager oc lantzerøs nøtøfft skal vtsigis, der skal ingin føre pennigs
øll, vden at han bliffuer sagidt tiil iii marck penninge:

930 Om vaardt
Vaard sider huer som er xviii aare gammel, och tiue aar skal han baffue fult vobn, oc xxii
alt fulle oppe holle

Boot om træ som hugger vden staur
Hugger du ud eck mandz y skoug: saa stor at hon icke suückter for øxne ocg nar it par vber
gaa fram: da bødt tuo sosling: om du bliffuer der y sandt, vden saa skeer ad axiil han brister
og gaar synder paa veien, oc ned er forbaanden, och da maa tu ligeuel hugge y selff y din
egin skog, nar tu est saa ner skougen, at tu kant see bode vber oc les, oc om du est icke saa
neer din egin skog, da maatu hugge sagsløft y en anners skog om du |est icke| blaffuer behoff:
Ask oc birck er oc tiil sosling høt, om de bliffue niid hugin: da som du niid hugger mandiz
speg eller skougmerekke: da bøder tu iij mark huert: ehuad somhelst det er eg eller fer: Och
om du faar en mandz |eg | eick: da boder tu sosling om det er saa stort att man kan sette
en solle par: Oc da som du faar en ring omkring: da bøder du lige som du hadde thet niid
huggit, faar tu ask eller birck for mandt, da bøder du lige som du niid hugge træit, oc om du
faar en ring om træit lige saa:

Add. D

cilla | eba A. | a stempno | keyner gemeynheit G. | stempno | stefnu A. | oc far ey sannad gart | ÷ G. | sannad | sannat A. | iij. | þriar A. | symi | syma A. | schal | scal A.
Om træ boot innen stauers
Add. D
Hugger tu innen gierde nogen mands større træ, en thet snucke for øxne og nar de fram gaa, da bød en marck for første træ, och siden for huert en halff m(ark) tiil ḳ ᵃ ᵃ ᵃ ᵃ tre m(ark)
ᚠ Och ḳ om du hugger smærre træ: da bødt efetter las, som før var saat: och in hanem vitor'd som skogin eier, hugger du niid: och bær vstaff skouen: da bød viii ortuger det er uiu hui'de

Om vidt
Add. D
Och ḳ om tu tagir nogen mandz vidt eller gaardzuırcke, det er troer stauer eller banne eller timmær y skog: da bød iij : Om han haffuer først fram tiil veigen y hoff da bødt iij m(ark) om tu icke faar hannem thet igjen alt samens lige saa gott oc lige saa mögit om du est sand der y, vide sielff med ed, nar alsamen er

Om mands lidt
Add. D
Hugger y naagin mands lidbalcke, da bød saa for huer som han dyr er, den balck som mitt y er den bød'er du iij alber oc de tuo andre som der ere nest, den ene for niden, den annen for offuen, da bød for for v gunníske: ṛoc de tuo som ere nest ṛoc den niderste oc den øffuerste huer dere tiil søsling:

Aff dør
Add. D
Hugger du y mandz dør eller y dørretre, da bød første hug iij alber, oc annet tiil v gunnisk, oc trædie tiil søslings, och saa siden huert hug tiil iį m(ark)

Om stuck eller stødt
Add. D
Om tu hugger y stock eller y stødt for mandt: da bød huert hug tiil søslings oc siden tiil tuo
Aff Sma filedi ‘omercht’

Kumber o mercht sma filedi till mans, ta haffui til kyrkior, oc til eyns tinga. Kennis thet ey ater, ta lati warda: oc taki tings laun aff, oc schiptin sochnar thy som yfir ier.

Aff swinom.

Kuma storari swin til mans tan sma grisir merchtir ella omerchtir: ta schal haffua til tyggia tinga. oc tridia tridiungs tings, oc haffui ertauugh fyri ting: Kennis thet ey ater tha wirdin sochna men, oc taki tings laun aff, oc schiptin sochna men, thy som yfir ier:

Aff Bolambum.

Kuma bolamb til mans tha haffui til tyggia tinga, oc tridia tridiungs tinghs, oc haffui vp vm try ar: oc taki laun eptir thi som tridiunger haffuer fyri wana hafft, ¶ En thet som tar aukas aff, ta haffi tan som fydir.

Aff faštom weduri.

mark
Aff kliptom weduri. 61.
Slipper faster wedur cliptur laus eptir Simonis messo iude: ta haffui fyri gangit sielf-
fuom simur, til thes tima, som men haffua wana hafft (<at>) loyst lata: tan schal ater
Biauda hinom som slepti, med hans sochna manna witnom: ¶ Ta en han wil ey ater
loysa: ta haffui tan som fick, oc leggi a mercki sett, med sielffuins sochna manna
witnom.

Aff Buckom oc Geytom. 62.
Buckom oc gietom schal man vp heita vm tu aar, so schal ater loysa geyt fyri vj.
penn(ninga) à hwario tingsi, oc Buck fyri ertaug.

Aff nautom oc Russom. 63.
Naut oc Rus schal vp heita a twem tingom, oc tridia tridungs tingi, vm try ar: kennis
thet ey ater a fyrsta tingi, ta schal wirda, oc tan vp heita, oc haffui twar ertaug
fyri tingh, hwart. ¶ Taim naut ella Rus som nytia ma, tha nyt med sochnamanna
kenno: oc fari ey til wisbyar mid: wta a fyrsta tingi, ella leydi oc leggi aff sadul, oc

[985–986] Kumber faster wedur ocliptur til mans, ta taki ertaug fyri hepta laun, Kennis han ey
ater, ta taki so laun som fyri annor lamb.

[990–995] Ta en han wil ey ater
loysa: ta haffui tan som fick, oc leggi a mercki sett, med sielffuins sochna manna
witnom.

[996–1000] Taim naut ella Rus som nytia ma, tha nyt med sochnamanna
kenno: oc fari ey til wisbyar mid: wta a fyrsta tingi, ella leydi oc leggi aff sadul, oc
bindi so fierri (et) mot stucka at magi sia mid allom vp heislu soydom.

**Aff Amerki.**

Hwar som amerki gier a annars filedi, vtan thet si kaupt ella at heimfylgi geffuit, oc warder tar sander, at: ta Byti iij. M(arkr).

**Aff Akrom.**

Haffua fleirin men akra saman, oc wilia sumir sa, oc sumir liggia lata: ta radin teir som meira aiga: oc segin til fyri mariu messu i fastu, hwat teir helder wilia liggia lata ella sa: ¶ En schiptas landboar vm ta haffui vj. pen(niga) fyri laups land, tan som bort far, aff theim som tar komber à, fyri akra ta som han ey far sa, oc Rymin their om hoyslet, hwar fyri adrom so margra lassa rum som Bol gerder at markum.

**Aff Rofu Akrom.**

Hwar bondi som sed haffer, ta haffi laups land til Rofu akers, vm hwart aar: ¶ En seda laust folck, som hus haffer ta haffui halffs laups land, til Rofu akers, oc tan lati oykin til, som aker eyger. ¶ Hwar som ey halder thitta: ta wari saker wider sochn, at iij. oyrom. ¶ En huilich sochn som ey thitta rychtar: ta wari sak wide r sochn, at iij. oyrom. ¶ En huilich sochn som ey thitta rychtar: ta wari sak wide r sochn, at iij. oyrom.
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M(arkum) en a ting kumber.

Aff haffreki. 67.
Hittėr mader haffrek à landi: ta haffui attunda pen(niga) hwarn aff fynd: ¶ hittir mader a fluta wtj, oc tarff wider schips oc ara: ella hitter han a haffs butnj, oc tarff widr krok oc kexi, ta haffui tridiung aff fund sinni. ¶ Tha en han hitter yr lands syn: tha haffui halft aff thet som han hitti.

Aff Eldi

Aff Bieru Eldi.
Da en schadi scher aff bieru eldi, ta byti halffu werildi sino, tan som Bier. tha en oformaga scher slicht: ta geldi than som wisar.

Aff Broan. 70.

348
Thet ier oc semt sick, at broa schal vm hwart aar i allom sochnom: hulikin sochn som ey broar ta Byti iij. M(arkr) tingi.

Aff Schutti. 71.


Aff Wardi. 72.


Aff husom oc hus tiaudom. 73.

Hwar som seter hus nider vtan sochninna luff ta wari saker at iij. M(arkum) wider sochn, oc Rymi vp hus i sama ari.

< G: van hůs dyben >

¶ Hwar som taker hus tiaud vtan sochninna luff: ta wari saker at iij. oyrom.

Aff Byrslu folki. 74.

[All text for this page is in Old Norse and is not translatable into modern languages due to the historical and linguistic context.]
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Alt byrslu folck som à Bondans Braudi ier: ganger thet bort o helgan dagh, aff gardi oloyfis sins husbonda: tan leiffui ater ertaug, vm hwarin aff sinnj leighu. oc fulli dags wercki ater.

Aff sædalaus folki. 75.


Aff ikornom. 76.

Hwar som far at ikornom fyri Symonis messo iude, oc eptir mariu messo y fastu, Byti iij. M(arkr) En fari engin innan staurs vtan | han heti wider iij. M(arkum) Luff eiganda.

Aff harum. 77.

Fari engin at harom med gildri eptir mariu messo i fastu, ella fyri Simonis messu

---

iudæ, vtan han heti wider iij. M(arkum).

Aff schaffli. 78.
Thitta ier oc semt sick, at skafl alt schal haffua helg til yfru mario messu: ¶ Hwar som thitta briauter. Byti kirkio mannom ‘iij.’ oyra: aff thesso haffi halfft tan som sykr: ¶ Briauta oformagar, ta Bytin halffu minna:

Aff messo fallom. 79.

Aff duffli. 80.
Duffli ier aff takit: Hwar som dufflar, ta wari sak eir at iij. oyrom wid eir sochn: wil ey sochn sykia ta Byti sochn iij. M(arkum) tingi.

Aff Burgan wider byamen. 81.
Burgan wider byaman ier oc fybrudin. ¶ Kaupi engin meira en han orkar betala.

Aff Burgan wider byamen] ÷ A; ÷ G; ÷ D.

Aff Burgan wider byamen] ÷ A; ÷ G; ÷ D.

Aff Burgan wider byamen] ÷ A; ÷ G; ÷ D.

Aff Burgan wider byamen] ÷ A; ÷ G; ÷ D.

Aff Burgan wider byamen] ÷ A; ÷ G; ÷ D.
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82. Vm schoga:
Hwar som hagger i mans schogom innan staurus ella vtan, oc Akir til Bytti ijj. M(arkr) pen(ninga) oc gieri heilt at eir. ¶ Hwar som rifir mans gard, so at Aka ma ginom, \(<ha>\) Bytti ijj. M(arkr) pen(ninga). ¶ Huar som far oloyfis yfir mans eygu, Byti ijj. oyra. ¶ Rifir man gluggu à gardi mans, Byti ijj. oyra:

Um festu eigur allar
tar loysins ella wírdins in sama lyčtrygiom ella festins tar som taar kompnar ieru. ¶ Hwar som fyri gier triggs marka leigi, at tranglauso \(<driffuer hanem der til>) Haffi fyri gart sinom halsi, oc kuna hans kirckiu stedi sinom, oc standi at er i stapli:

Teth ier oc sempt sik: At
thet ieru lag som hier ieru schriffat i. ¶ Thet schulu allir man halda: ¶ Tha en nakrar atbyrder konno at warda, som ey hittas hier i: taar schulu slitas med domera

1075 \(<huar sum nequar af þissum brjautr. bytj. tolf marcr landi.>\) Allar festu eygur schulu haffua frest vm try aar. til gelda som meirin ieru en M(ark) S(ilfs). Ta ma ey oyra wirda en hin ey wil, vtan eygu, oc haffi than han frest vm try Aar:

1078 82. Vm schoga: \([in marg. add. super 40]

1078 82. Vm schoga: \([in marg. add. super 40]

1078 82. Vm schoga: \([in marg. add. super 40]\)
register paa forschreffne Low.

APPENDIX D. A CRITICAL EDITION OF GUTA LAG


1115 annan ] leg. annars

1113 Hesta kaupi | cauptum hestj A. 1113 Rider tu annan mans hest | af hesta tect A. 1114 Gezlu | gezlum A. 1114 Ransakan | ransaki A. 1114 Rethi | reth A. 1114 ord | orþum A. 1115 Sma filedi omercht | o mercu sma fileþi A. 1116 kliptom wedurj | fastum veþuri cliptum A. 1118 Broan | broa gerþ A. 1119 Byrslu | byrgslu A. 1120 ikornom | .i. cornum sic A. 1120 Harum | herum A. 1121 Aff Burgan wider byamen | ÷ A. 1121 Um schoga oc festu Eigur allar | ÷ A.
Appendix E

Danish ordinances in Bilefeld’s hand


Om Alfar weye. 1.
Huilken mand ther Alfar weye spijller, med grøfft, eller affpløyning, eller formener med gærde, Bøde Konningen ii. Mark thett er xxx. penning danske, so ath ther er i hver sagemarck, ii. fierdingh gutniske.

Om trette om Jord. 2.
Hwor trette worder om marckeskell eller om Jord, och worder neffn til tagen, at
granske och swerie ther om, hwilcken ther worder tagen y then neffn, och ey wil swere eller granske, Bøde Konningen iij. Mark

Om fredkiøb for mandrab

Om fredkiøb for mandrab, then som dræber Bøde Konningen xxiiij. Mark Sølffs til fredkiøb, Er ther nogre flere y then gierningh, som saa Giøris: tha skulle the staa y thenne samme fredkiøb med saguolderen, och ther med nyde deris fred for Kronens Embitzmand: Thenne for’ne’ Artickel wor Domerens och Almwens begæringe, att so maa staa, och bliffue effter gamble sædwene.

Om mand med wrede tager anden mand y sith hwß.

Far mand med wrede, och tager anden mand y sith hwß, eller paa syn agger, som hand pløier, eller skeer, eller nogen anden stedtz paa marcken, som hand haffuir saad sitt spiud, syn skioldt, eller sadel lagt, och so tagitt sig herberge, tha fordj att thesse maall ere Ens till Raade meldt effter Lougen, om mand tha worder drebt aff anden paa thenne sted, tha Bøde hand ther høffding wor y theris ferd, fuld mandbod, och for werck Bøde aff sith Konningen xl. Mark och hwer aff thennem y følge wor med, Bøde Konningen iij. Mark skonske.

Om mand Bryder op anden mands dør.

Bryder mand op anden mands dør, haffuer hand med sig v. Lags mend, med v. fulle waben, och tager hand nogitt vdt med wold, so att ther er sandt widtne till, werge sig med neffnd, Swergis hand skyldig eller hand gaar widt Bøde Konningen xl. Mark

Om nogen saarer Anden.

Hwo som saarer anden, hwad saar thett helst er, tha bøde konningen iij. Mark vden huad med wade skeer, och mod wilie Bøde ey konningen for.

Om mand dræber anden offuer Bøtte Bøder.

Dræber mand anden offuer bøtte Bøder, were fredløß, och faa aldrig fred igen, och
Konningen tage alt thett hand haffuer, vden hans Jord.

Om Konningen er Jnden Lands. 8.
Then time ther Konningen er inden landtz, tha skal hwer mand haffue fredt, End worder nogen drebt then time at Konningen er Jnden landtz ligge wed hans fred der dræbte, oc faa aldrigh fred Jgen, vden hwes Konningen och den døde frender will.

Om slætzmaal naer konningen er inden landtz. 9
Saarer mand anden, meden konningen er inden landtz, Bøde for saar saa som lowgen er och konningen xl. Mark

Om mange hande hwgh. 10.
For steenshwg, Beenshwg, neffue hwgh, haargriff, oc Jord skuff for hwer thesse sager skall Bødis konningen iij. Mark eller Dylle medt tylther Eedt.

Om wade saar. 11.
For wade saar skal ey Bødis konningens rett mer end hannem skal Bødis ther saar fick, Siger siden konningens Embitzmand, att thett saar war med willie giort, och ey medt wade, tha skall then ther saar giorde, først Swere att hand giorde thett med wade, och ey med wilie. Thernest skal hand tilgaa ther saarit fick och swere att thett war sandingen then anden saer, och siden gange til neffnd och lade thennom widtne och swere effter thennom Baade, Thette er thett ene maal ther neffnd kommer for Konningens rett.

Om mand tapper sine Kaaste. 12.
Tapper mand sine kaast och far epther och Bædis Randsaken hiemme att andermandtz och sønnis hannem, tha fare til ij. eller iij grander och lade thennem høre at hannem Sønnis ther Baade Randsaken och anden rett, och fare siden till tings med sine vidtne, neécter hand att hand, Sønde hannem ey Randsaken eller anden rett, stande for med tylther eedt, Brøster hannem lough Bøde Konningen iij. Mark
siden were y Bondens wold, hwor meget hand wil hannem kende eller saqh giffue.

**Om Tiuffuerie.**

Om tiuffuerie skall Bliffue som gammel Sædwene haffuer werit, Effter Gudlandtz Lowg, och skall tiuffuen ey forbryde mere end sit hoffuidtlodt, Ey hans hustruis och ey hans Barns, vden then gienningh er thennem witterlig, ther saa giørs, och the døllie med hannem. Er och nogen barn, ther icke er kommen til Sin lough Alder, thett Barns hoffuidt lod, skall ey were forbrødt, Ey maa och tiuffuen forstiele syn Jord, men Bør att bliffue hoss hans arffuinge, om hand bliffuer hengdt eller affliifruit.

**Om handrann.**

For handran skal Bødis iij. (mark) eller Suerie medt tylther eedt for, Aelther mand anden vden hans gard Bøde iij øre eller fire mends eedt frore.

**Om mand huggir inden vdaff anden mands gard.**

Hugger mand inden vdtaff anden mands gard, vden hans willie Bøde iij. Mark eller swerie med tylther eedt.

**Om gardings werck.**

Giør mand gardings werck eller gierning offuer anden mands fæ med Spiud eller anden syn waben, so ath indwollen vdgaa, och dræber so anden mandz fæ, saa gott som j. Mark Gielde atter fæ, saa gott efter lowgen som hans vitne eller wording er til, ther thett Aatte, och Bøde iij. Mark Konningen, eller døllie med tylther eed for, att hand dræbte dett ey.

**Om mand rider anden mands hest**


**Om woldtaggelse.**
Jngen mand maa woldtage nogen qwindfolck. Enthen wdj obne marck, eller y hwsit
hiemme: Døll hand och er ey vidtne til skerre sig med iij. tølther eedt, Er vidtne
till, døllit med neffnd, worder hand sworn skyldigh eller handgaar widt. Bøde
Konningen xl. Mark

Om mand Setter Jld wtj anden mandtz gard eller huß. 19.
Hwo som setter Jld, med syn fry wilie wtj anden mands gard, hwß eller Egen, døllie
med herritz neffnd om hand will winde hannom paa sworn Eedt ther skaden fick.
Swergis hand skyldigh, tha haffue dags rum och natt frest, att rette for sigh, worder
hand siden fanget, tha maa hand ophengis, som en anden tiuff, om hand will ther
skaden fick  Worder hand hengt, Tage Bonden gield for skade, so som fanget er
till, och Konningen hans hoffuidt lodt:  Saa skall och then fare som Rider till med
herre skioeldt och Brender anden mands gard, hwß, eller Eygn: -

Om frædløß mand ath herberge. 20.
Hwo som herberger frædløß mand, bø Konningen iij. Mark eller døllie med tølther
eedt, att hand wiste ey att hand war fredløß.

Om mand griber sagløß mand. 21̇.
Griber mand Sagløß mand och fører hannem Sagløß emod Syn wilie aff hans gard,
Bøde Konningen xl. Mark och hwer aff thennem y følge war med Bøde iij. Mark

Om ketterie. 22.
Hwo som bliffuer befuneden mett ketterie, och the ther ligge med theris slegčt,
Swogre, eller fædre som forbuden er i lowen, hand Gelde sit liff och kronens Embi-
ztmand tage hans hoffuit lodt y alle löse øre, och hans Jord bliffuer wed hans
arffuinger, worder hand och løß for penninge, nyde sielff Sin Jord,

Om mand dyller sin Jord eller skat: 23.
Hwo som dyller syn iord eller skatt som ther bør aarlig aff at gange, thett er swig
emod Konningen och Almwen, hwo ther med findis Bøde vj. Mark Sølffs. wdrede

\[112\] bø | leg. bøde \[125\] hand | del. hans
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skatten igen staaar.

130 **Om wedertegth.**
Hwor nogett wedertegth worder lagtt och vidtagen y nogen Bye, och ey holdis, Bøde vj. *Mark Sølffs* tyll konningen hwo, thett Bryder.

135 **Om ødegaarde.**
Øde gaarde skall gjøris fuld konningens tyng och redslæ wdaff Som aff the Bygde gaarde.

140 **Om Bismer, Schepper, Alne och wegcte.**
Om Bisper, schepper, Alne oc Anden wegeč, skall were paa landett Eblant Almwen, som y wisbye er, findis nogen ther emod att gjøre som ey haffue rett wegcę, schepper och Alne som forneffntt staaar, Bøde xxiiij. *Mark Sølffs* till Konningen.

145 **Om opreisning Emod Danmarckis Krone.**
Huo som giør opreisning och fører affuindtz skiold, emod Danmarckis Krone, haffue forbrøtt syn Jord, till Kronen, och Rettis offuer personen, som offuer en forreder.

150 **Om mistag paa nogit godtz.**
Huo som mistagh tager paa nogitt godtz, Thaa schal ther were Andett sodant igen tilstæde, lige lydt och lige merckt, och siden Bøde for saadan mistagh iij. *Mark skoniske* till Konningen.

155 **Om mand finder nogen Kaaste.**
Huo som finder nogen kaaste, hand lyse thett op till Sognekircken obenbarlig eller till tinghe for Dommeren, døller hand thett, Tha maa hand bliffue eller worde tyff therfore: Kommer icke tha rett eyer mand, och kendis wid, sodan fremmede kaaste, inden lauge tidt, Tha Konningens Embitzmand thett annamme paa Konningens

---

*In marg. add. †. alias wederlough ¹. Bisper ². leg. Bisper*
wegne.

**Om hoffmeir, Block hwß eller Bullwerck.**

Hwo som neder bryder, Brender eller forderffuer hoffmeir, Blockhwß eller bullwerck, som Bygde ere til landtzens wern, hand Bøde schaden, och giøre thett so gott igen, och ther till vj Mark Sølffs till konningen.

**Om Alle Dommere.**

Alle Dommere, Bode Settings dommere och Andre skulle effter denne dagh Dømme Emelom herskab(ı)t och then ther Bryder, effter denne lowgh som forschreffuit staar och giffue ther breff paa.

**En Summa eller beslutningh paa thenne lowg.**

Findis nogre andre sager som nogen mand kand forbryde sig wtj eller mißgiøre, som icke nu tilforne Er befunden, och ey heller Brøde vdtryckis Tha skall Ther bødis emod Konningen so megit som emod Sagwolleren Effter gamble gudlands lowg. ¶ Item hwor som neffnis ii. Mark Brøde i thenne forskreffne loug, Ere the icke Bedre end xxx. danske *skilling* och hwor som xl. Mark neffnis Ere the icke Bedre end xx. Mark sølffs. ¶ Item hwo som Bryder wtj nogen thisse forskreffne sager, puncter eller andett hwad hand ther for dømmnis vdt at giffue aff dommer(e)ne her wtj landett effter forskreffne lowgs liwdelse, thet skall hand aldelis fuldgiøre till Konningen, inden ii. vgger ther Effter, Hwor hand icke thet giør, Tha maa hand therfor hindris aff Lenssmanden om hand icke fænger wederheffttings Borgen for sigh, som sædwene Er, her paa landett, och werit haffuer, forthi Tingit ganger icke vden en tidt om Aarit, adt hand kand wider komme att dele thett faldsmal vde effter Gudtlandtz Low. ¶ item Ingen Bonde paa Gudtland maa flytte aff landett och ind y wisbye, eller theris Sønner, vden the haffue thett wtj Konningens Embitzmand minde:

**Recess Som Konning Christian Konning Frederichssøn haffuer ladet vdtgaa, offuer Sitt och Kronens land Godtland, om ordning och skick att holde paa landett, Anno1537. Som her effter følger.**

**Om vndersaattis liwdelse emod herskabit.**
Først att Effterdj wore vndersotte och Jndbyggere paa wort land Gottland haffuer wor fuldme揖ige statholder paa Wisborg hwaldskab loffuit och med eedt forplie揖ett thro hørsame vnderdanigh edt, Tha skulle the ther fuld kommelig haffue a揖 paa wed then eedt the oss sworit haffuer, om nogen Eblant thennom findis som samme eedtz forplie揖ingh icke giort haffuer, eller icke holle wille, Skulle ther fore fordrief-fuis aff landett, eller straffis therfor aff wor Embitzmand som whørsom eller wly-diger eedtz forkrencker widbør.

Om meen eeder. 2.
Hwo som helst ther findis wtj meen eedt nogenstedtz hwor Dom och rett Settis, eller med falsk vidnisbyrd, Thaa skal hand straffis første gang, paa sit godtz och penningh effter syn yderste formwe, findis hand siden, anden gangh, thaa skal hand wtj lige made straffis paa sith godtz och penninge, och siden foruisis aff landett, bliffter hand tredie gang befundit ther med, tha skall hannem huggis ij. finger aff, och siden holdis for en falsk lågner saa lenge hand leffuer.

Om mandrab. 3.
Om mandrab er nu saa beslutett att nar mandraberen findis, och efftermals mand kommer, och klager thett for wor Embitzmand, Tha skal wor Embitzmand rette sig Effter att straffe ther offuer, So frampt att hand will icke stande o揖 til rette therfor:
- Hwor nogen giør nogen mandrab och thett icke skeer aff wade eller nødwerie, tha skall mandraberen miste sitt liff, och mandraberens godtz och hoffuidt lodt were forbrødt halfftt till oss och halfft til den dødis neste arffuinger, och ther med skall mandraberens Sle揖 och wenner were qvitt och frie aff o揖 och then dødis sle揖, och ey besweris med nogen ydermere Bodt, och ther som mandraberen, och hans medtftølgere vndkommer tha skall wore fogeder, och Embitzmand lade Rette offuer hans halß, hwor the hannem ther Effter kunde offuir komme, och alt hans hoffuídt lodt, halffdeden till oss, och anden halffdeden til den dødis neste arffuinger: och mandraberens sle揖 och wenner skulle hermed were qwitt och frie wdj alle made. Rømmer och flyer
Copenhagen, Arnamagnæan Collection, AM 54 4to, known as Codex B, is one of two main manuscripts containing the medieval law code of Gotland, *Guta lag*, in the Old Gutnish language. Despite preserving a longer recension of the law, this sixteenth-century paper manuscript has received relatively less attention due to its age and foreign scribe.

The first chapter of this dissertation opens with a presentation of the historical and linguistic context of Codex B. Following a discussion of previous research into the manuscript is a reflection of the theories and methodologies used in the present study, which fall within the disciplines of textual philology and historical linguistics.

Chapter 2 presents the results of a codicological study of Codex B and the remaining six manuscripts containing *Guta lag*. Following the theories of material philology, it is argued that the scribe copied the manuscript for his own personal use as a reference tool, which bears significant consequences for how the language of the manuscript can be studied and understood.

Chapter 3 examines the manuscript text and its relation the remainder of the corpus. The previous stemma of *Guta lag* is rejected on methodological grounds, while a new grouping places Codex B closer to the 1401 German translation of the law code. The chapter further discusses the possible origins of the numerous marginal notes found in the manuscript, which have been typologically categorized.

Chapters 4-6 are a systematic investigation into the linguistic deviations found in Codex B, divided into orthography and phonology (Chapter 4), morphology (Chapter 5), and lexicon (Chapter 6). It is argued that in all domains the linguistic features can be placed in three distinct layers: (1) retention of older forms not found elsewhere in the corpus, (2) younger, native Gutnish developments, and (3) influence from Danish, both by the scribe of Codex B and earlier in the recension.

Finally, the dissertation concludes with a summary of findings and considers possible features of the now-lost exemplar manuscript from 1470.
København, Arnamagnæanske Samling, AM 54 4to, kaldet Codex B, er en af to hovedkilder til Gotlands middelalderlige lovtekst *Guterlov* skrevet på det oldgutniske sprog. Selvom håndskriften indeholder en længere redaktion af teksten, har det kun fået begrænset opmærksomhed inden for forskningen – dels pga. dets alder, dels pga. skriveren, som var dansker og ikke gotlænding.

I første kapitel gennemgår den historiske og sproglige baggrund for Codex B. Derefter følger en diskussion om tidligere forskning i håndskriften samt refleksioner over de tekstfilologiske og sproghistoriske teorier og metoder, jeg har anvendt.

I kapitel 2 præsenteres resultaterne af en kodikologisk undersøgelse af Codex B og de øvrige håndskrifter af *Guterlov*. Det konkluderes ud fra en nyfilologisk tilgang, at skriveren har kopieret Codex B til eget brug, hvilket har stor indflydelse på, hvordan sproget i det må studeres og forstås.


Kapitlerne 4-6 er en systematisk undersøgelse af de særlige sproglige afvigelser i Codex B, opdelt i ortografi og fonologi (Kapitel 4), morfologi (Kapitel 5) og leksikon (Kapitel 6). Der argumenteres for, at de omtalte træk inden for alle domæner kan placeres i tre lag: (1) ældre former, der ikke findes andre steder i korpuset, (2) yngre gutniske udviklinger og (3) påvirkninger fra dansk, både under indflydelse fra skriveren og tidligere i redaktionen.

Til sidst opsummeres afhandlingens resultater med en diskussion af mulige træk i det forsvundne forlæg fra 1470.